

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1932

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., minister of Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with the din of clamorous and clamant voices in our ears, we would hush earth's noises and wait in this quiet moment for the still, small voice of the Eternal Spirit, lest we forget whose servants we are. Amid the tumult and shouting of troubled days we would lift our eyes to the eternal verities. In our bewildering doubt and darkness lift upon us the light of Thy countenance, Thou God who hast been our help in ages past, Thou who art our hope for years to come. Breathe through the heats of our desire Thy coolness and Thy balm. In discordant and disordered days may our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace.

We pray for new insights and for larger sympathies. Recognition of our oneness in Thee makes vivid our realization of the oneness of humanity across all separating barriers of border or breed or birth. Lift the levels of our thinking and living above the fog of blinding prejudice and selfish seeking.

As we look to Thee now in this national shrine of each patriot's devotion, inspire these servants of Thine and of the people to face the vast needs of the present and of the future with dauntless courage and that brotherly compassion for the baffled and discouraged multitudes which moved the heart of that Lord and Master of us all. We ask it in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar days of Monday, May 30, and Tuesday, May 31, 1932, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Couzens	Jones	Schall
Bailey	Cutting	Kean	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dale	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barbour	Dickinson	Keyes	Shortridge
Barkley	Dill	King	Smith
Bingham	Fess	La Follette	Smoot
Black	Fletcher	Logan	Steiwer
Blaine	Frazier	McGill	Stephens
Borah	George	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Glass	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Glenn	Metcalf	Townsend
Bulkeley	Goldsborough	Moses	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Walcott
Carey	Hatfield	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Cohen	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hebert	Pittman	Watson
Coolidge	Howell	Reed	Wheeler
Cope land	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LXXV—737

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Howard O. Haggberg, of Isle, Minn., praying for the passage of legislation providing for the issuance of additional currency and the payment of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates (bonus), which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Square Table Club, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and the return to the States of the regulation and control of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate letters from H. J. Ryan, of Nashville, Tenn., submitting certain recommendations for legislation, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DILL presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens, being unemployed veterans and members of the Spokane County (Wash.) Unemployed League, praying "that ample provision be made by the constituted authorities, county, State, and Federal, for food, clothing, shelter, heat, light, and water, for ourselves and fellow citizens," etc., which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BYRNES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Greenville and Woodruff, S. C., praying for the passage of legislation to eliminate all expenditures for veterans' disabilities not connected with war service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a resolution adopted by Rotary Club No. 1217, of Somerville, N. J., favoring the adoption of a general sales tax, a 10 per cent reduction in Federal salaries, and protesting against the passage of legislation to provide for the cash payment of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates (bonus), which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Square Table Club, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and the return to the States of the regulation and control of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Association of Leather Glove and Mitten Manufacturers of Gloversville, N. Y., favoring retrenchment in governmental expenditures, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Syracuse (N. Y.) Branch of the National Woman's Party, favoring the adoption of a reservation to the World Court protocols providing that the code of law to be administered by the World Court shall not contain inequalities based on sex, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against discrimination in taxation against the automotive industry and favoring the adoption of a general sales tax in lieu of such taxation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying for the passage of House bill 9891, providing a pension system for railroad employees, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions from 110 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the

11703

modification of the Volstead Act and the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions from 125 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for retrenchment in governmental expenditures, particularly in payments and pensions to veterans not disabled in time of war, and also the balancing of the Budget, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions from 150 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the balancing of the Budget, the defeat of cash bonus proposals, and the stopping of "all raids on the Treasury," retrenchment in governmental expenditures, amendment of the Volstead Act, and the taxing of light wine and beer, etc., which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPEAL OF THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I present a petition in the form of resolutions of members of the Worcester Women's Democratic Club, of Worcester, Mass., favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures, as follows:

Resolved, That we, the members of the Worcester Women's Democratic Club assembled in session this the 28th day of May wish to go on record as being in favor of the eighteenth amendment being repealed, as we believe that this was never constitutional.

Resolved, That if the eighteenth amendment is retained, some system should be inaugurated that would compel those desiring the enforcement share the necessary expense of same.

Resolved, That we present the above sentiments to our United States Senator, DAVID I. WALSH, to have him give this immediate attention.

GLADYS I. HENNESSY (and others).

MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, some days ago I received a letter from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts asking that there be incorporated in the revenue bill a provision expressly exempting States and subdivisions of States from payment of the tax on the sales of articles covered in the special section of the revenue bill imposing certain excise taxes. The opinion of the experts and of the committee was that such a provision was not necessary. In connection with the explanation I have made, I ask that the letter to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Statehouse, Boston, May 9, 1932.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: If the Federal revenue bill is to provide excises or taxes on various commodities ranging as to articles from automobiles and lubricating oils to checks and telegrams, the Commonwealth and its subdivisions will be vitally affected.

For that reason I am writing to call your attention to the fact that it would be of great assistance to Massachusetts and its subdivisions to have written into the revenue bill a provision expressly exempting governmental activities from the Federal charge, instead of being obligated, as at present, to establish the fact, in asking for refunds, that the tax was exacted on a transaction purely in the exercise of a governmental function.

The original revenue proposal (H. R. 10236) as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House March 7, 1932, carried a provision under the title of manufacturers' excise tax providing for exemption from the excise as to governments. This appears at page 239, at lines 13-15, inclusive. Under this provision the following would not be subject to the tax:

"(5) Sales to a State or political subdivision thereof, or any agency thereof by articles for use solely in the exercises of a governmental function."

I believe Commissioner Long has already talked this matter over with you at length. I am, therefore, not going into greater details other than to back him up by saying that there will be permanent and material benefit to the Commonwealth by including some such provision as that quoted above in whatever revenue bill is enacted by Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. ELY.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Banking and Currency to report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 11499) for restoring and maintaining the purchasing power of the dollar, which is known as the Goldsborough bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

THE WORLD COURT (REPT. NO. 758)

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and myself and by direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I submit from that committee a report on the protocols concerning adherence of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice. In all reasonable probability there will be a considerable demand for copies of the report. I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] whether some additional copies might be printed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is not in the Chamber at the moment, but I am a member of the Committee on Printing and I am sure there will be no difficulty in having that done.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. FESS. In order to get a sufficient number I would suggest that the report be made a public document. I think that will give us a sufficient number. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report can be printed in the usual manner.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I inquire what the report is? Is it the report on the World Court?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let us take it up. It is 15 minutes after 12 now.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator what his intentions are with regard to fixing a date for taking up the matter?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like very much to agree upon a date at the next ensuing session of Congress.

Mr. REED. It seems to me that would be reasonable, but I am informed that we evidently can not get an agreement. So I suppose it will be necessary to move to make the matter a special order. That can be done only in executive session.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We shall take it up later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be printed as a Senate report.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4791) to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the city of Prescott municipal watershed in the Prescott National Forest within the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4792) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Lane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 168) to authorize the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by agriculture, labor, and capital, to revive trade, and promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SECOND READING AND REFERENCE OF A BILL

The bill (S. 4632) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States and municipalities was read the second time by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1932

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 174) for an investigation of campaign expenditures of presidential, vice presidential, and senatorial candidates in 1932 (submitted by Mr. DICKINSON on March 1, 1932), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11267, the legislative appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 58, insert, beginning at line 5:

"(b) This section shall not apply to any person retired for injuries received in battle."

On page 106, line 14, strike out the period after the figures "1928" and insert a comma and "within six months from date of approval of this act."

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11267, the legislative appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 57, line 23, strike out "\$3,000" and the balance of that line, and strike out lines 24 and 25, and strike out, on page 58, line 1, down to and including the word "elect."

In lieu thereof insert "the rate of pay which such person was receiving as such commissioned officer immediately before retirement."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11267, the legislative appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 56, line 24, strike out the following: "For night work."

Mr. LEWIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11267, the legislative appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 56, line 24, to strike out the words "for night work."

Mr. MOSES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11267, the legislative appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 59, line 11, after the word "citizens," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "Or to officers and employees of the Foreign Services of the United States whose official station is in foreign countries," so that the proviso will read as follows:

"Provided, That nothing herein shall apply to civilian officers and employees of the Panama Canal located on the Isthmus and who are American citizens, or to officers and employees of the Foreign Services of the United States whose official station is in foreign countries."

On page 66, line 5, after the word "cost," strike out the remainder of the section and insert the following: "thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 per cent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 per cent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The surplus receipts from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government. The selling price of publications as provided for herein shall be in lieu of that prescribed in the public resolution approved May 11, 1922 (U. S. C., title 44, secs. 72 and 220), and section 42 of the act of January 12, 1895 (U. S. C., title 44, sec. 114)."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10236) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CRISP, Mr. RAINY, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. TREADWAY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 1029. An act for the relief of Basil N. Henry; and

H. R. 4868. An act for the relief of George E. Casey.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 26) to establish a commission to be known as the United States Roanoke Colony Commission to report a plan and program for the celebration in 1934 of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of English-speaking civilization in America on Roanoke Island, N. C., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SENATORS FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a clipping from the Minneapolis Tribune entitled "In Defense of Our Senators" may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF OUR SENATORS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE:

In reply to David E. Hasey's wild and woolly warbling about the Farmer-Labor Party being of no value, and his claim that Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD did not accomplish anything, I must say that it is my opinion that men of Mr. Hasey's stamp are the reason that Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD can not accomplish the great and good deeds that he proposes. I would judge by Mr. Hasey's warbling that he does not read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If he does read it I would refer him to SHIPSTEAD's speeches made on December 22, 1931, February 6, 1932, March 7, 1932. I would also call his attention to a speech made by Hon. TOM SCHALL on March 16, 1932—a masterpiece. I suppose Mr. Hasey is well posted on Abraham Lincoln's speeches and Theodore Roosevelt's advice.

If he can show me where Lincoln or Roosevelt have showed any more wisdom than SCHALL and SHIPSTEAD I will be pleased to be shown, providing he does not make such foolish and rank mistakes as he has made in his write-up of May 25, 1932.

I will be glad to send Mr. Hasey a few of my CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS if he will read them.

I am and have been a Republican for 50 years, but not a hide-bound Republican that can not support a man that believes it is his duty to preserve our Constitution, our flag, and our people regardless of his political party. People with real blood in their arteries support men for office and for leadership who believe in our representative form of government. I could cast my vote for a Democrat conscientiously if he was for the best interests of our country, but not the Joe Robinson or Al Smith or Raskob brand.

There is not a State in the Union that has better Senators than our State of Minnesota, regardless of whether Mr. Hasey or anybody dislikes them because of their politics.

Best wishes to Mr. Hasey from a Bull Moose Republican.

J. J. MAIER, Graceville, Minn.

STUDY OF WAGE LOSSES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the so-called economy bill is about to be presented to the Senate. The bill referred to is expected seriously to affect the living standards and conditions of members of the National Federation of Federal Employees, an important association of workers, many of whom are friends and neighbors of ours, who have given long years of faithful service to the Government. Under direction of Mr. Luther C. Steward, president, and Miss Gertrude McNally, secretary, an exhaustive study has just been completed by that federation indicating estimated wage losses of such employees experienced since 1913, on the basis of the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar and changes in the cost of living. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, this important and suggestive study to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREFATORY STATEMENT

The following study, made for the national federation by its actuarial expert, Vice President Ulrey J. Biller, and considered the most complete and accurate of its kind ever attempted, is offered by the Government workers' organization as incontrovertible evidence that wage cuts now would have the effect of sharply accentuating a wage deflation trend which actually has been going on for nearly two decades.

Briefly, the national federation's study shows in a series of tables that, in all salary groups, workers have sustained continuing losses in "real wages" ever since 1913, the year used as a basis of comparison. This pre-war year is universally utilized by statisticians for comparative purposes.

For example, taking a \$900 a year clerk, it is revealed that with the advance of the Government's own Index Number for the Cost of Living from 100 in 1913 to 172.5 in 1924, the index value of the \$900 salary was \$1,553, while the actual salary was but \$1,028, making the average salary "lag" \$390, and the \$900 clerk's "real wage" a scant \$674.

Now, using this same clerk as an illustration after the enactment of the classification act, the federation's study shows that the index value of the \$900 salary from 1925 to 1931 averaged \$1,510, while the actual salary received was \$1,191. Here the salary lag was \$319, with the real wage only \$713. It is especially noteworthy that while the peak of the index number of the cost of living was reached in 1925, when it was 177.9, by 1931 it had fallen to only 145.8, still far above the 1913 mark of 100.

Furthermore, the study shows that for each \$900 clerk the salary lag, a definite actual loss to the individual, was \$6,518 from 1914 to 1931.

"Analysis of our tables will show," the national federation points out, "that the real wage of this \$900 clerk dropped to \$510 in 1919; that for 3 years it was below that of a laborer in 1913; and that the average annual real wage for the whole period of 18 years was below that paid to a junior messenger (\$720) in 1913.

"Moreover, what happened to this \$900 salary in loss of purchasing power also happened to every other statutory salary paid by the Government during this period. The salary lag, or loss in real wages, of all the employees in the Government service during these 18 years is so vast a sum that it is seemingly unbelievable, and one hesitates even to estimate the amount."

To afford a more comprehensive picture of what has occurred to all Federal wages, and to indicate the scope of the federation's survey, the organization has made public the facts with respect to the relatively limited number of \$5,000 salaries.

It is shown that the average index value of that salary was \$7,875 from 1914 to 1924, with the salary actually received standing unchanged at \$5,000. The real wage was \$3,345, with the salary lag averaging the surprisingly large sum of \$2,375. For the 11 years from 1914 to 1924, the total salary, at \$5,000, was \$55,000. The total real wage received was \$36,800, and the total loss in real wage \$18,200.

Analyses duplicating that made for the \$900 salary from 1913 to 1924 have been made by the national federation for the following wage groups: \$1,000, \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, \$1,800, \$2,000, \$2,350, \$2,500, \$3,000, \$3,600, \$5,000.

Commenting upon the facts developed, Luther C. Steward, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, has said:

"For perhaps the first time in the entire history of the Government, we now have accurate statistical data showing the cost of living for given years, the number of dollars paid to Federal workers, the amount of goods those dollars could buy, which means 'real wages,' and then a recapitulation of the losses sustained by virtue of declining purchasing power and markedly rising living costs.

"These data which we now have in hand prove conclusively that in addition to receiving salaries which are low, Government workers have had the further handicap of the above-mentioned economic factors. While wages in private industry and business have risen sharply in line with the reduced value of the dollar and the enhanced cost of living, the advances in Federal salaries have been commensurate in no way with changed conditions.

"These data are especially valuable at this time when proposals have been made to cut Federal salaries. The facts we have developed point clearly to the inevitable effect of such a step, and in themselves should show the way to the only just, equitable, and humane congressional solution."

WAGES AND THE COST OF LIVING: A STUDY OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE SALARY OF A \$900 CLERK FROM 1913 TO 1931

Seemingly only a few people have a clear conception of the fluctuating value of the dollar, as they appear to think that the dollar is an accurate measure of value, as the yardstick is of length, or the pound is of weight; but this is not the case, for the dollar is like rubber—it stretches and shrinks in value or in purchasing power. What follows is a story of the pay envelope of a \$900 clerical employee of the Government working in the District of Columbia from 1913 to 1931.

Brief definitions of the terms used in the article appear to be necessary, and are as follows:

Nominal wages v. real wages: A nominal wage is measured by the number of dollars the wage contains, but the real wage is measured by the purchasing power of the dollars in the nominal wage. The relationship existing between the nominal and the real wage, at different times, can best be ascertained by using the Government's index number, which shows the variations in the purchasing power of the dollar, as applied to the cost of living, year by year, since 1913.

The Government's index number: The Government's index number, compiled by the Department of Labor to show the variations in the cost of living, year by year, clearly gives the fluctuations in the purchasing power of the nominal wage and enables one to determine the real wage.

The index number for the cost of living is based on the cost of the six items, properly weighted, which constitute the principal purchases necessary for the support of a worker and his family. These items are as follows: Food, clothing, rent of dwelling, fuel and light, house-furnishing goods, and miscellaneous.

Basic number used: The Government's index number starts with the year 1913 and assumes that the cost of living for that year, measured by the prices paid for the six items mentioned above, is

a normal cost or standard, so the index number of 100 is given for the year 1913. Increases in the cost of living in later years are added to the base number of 100. For example, the index number for 1927 is 172. This indicates that the same items costing \$1 in 1913 cost \$1.72 in 1927.

Purchasing power of the dollar: The term "purchasing power of the dollar" is used to measure the difference in the purchasing units in \$1 in the different years since 1913 when compared with the purchasing units in the dollar in 1913. For example, in 1927 the index number was 172, which indicates that the dollar in 1927 was worth only 58 cents when compared with the dollar in 1913. If one will think of the dollars in 1913 as "big dollars," containing 100 cents, and the dollars received since that year as "little dollars," varying in value from 97 cents (1914) to 50 cents (1919 and 1920), the idea will be plain.

Statutory salaries: In 1913 the salaries of employees in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service of the Government working in the District of Columbia were fixed by law, and were, as a rule, \$900, \$1,000, \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, \$1,800, and \$2,000. There were higher salaries, but they were largely paid to administrative officials and to the professional service. There were then two grades of messengers, one receiving \$720 and the other \$840. The pay of laborers varied somewhat, but there was one class that received \$600 a year.

Index value: The term "index value" appearing in the table which follows is used to denote what the equivalent salary for the year should have been to equal the salary in purchasing power in 1913. To illustrate: A statutory salary of \$1,000 in 1913 had the same purchasing power that a salary of \$2,004 had in 1920, as the index number for the latter year is shown as 200.4.

Salary lag: This term denotes the salary loss due to the excess of the cost of living for the year under consideration over the cost of living in 1913, when the salaries for both years were the same amount; for example, an employee who had a salary of \$1,000 in 1913 and the same salary in 1920 had a "salary lag" in 1920 of \$1,004 (more "lag" than salary), as the index cost of living showed 200.4 for 1920, and whatever salary the employee received less than \$2,004 was a salary loss, or a "salary lag."

As the cost of living mounts wages increase, but much slower than the cost of living; always there is this salary lag.

During the World War all workers' salaries lagged behind the cost of living, and obviously the employers reaped the benefit, Uncle Sam included.

Actual salary: By actual salary is meant the statutory salary plus the bonus. The first bonus became effective on July 1, 1917, and the increase amounted to 10 per cent of the salary up to \$1,200 and 5 per cent of the salary from \$1,200 to \$1,800, both inclusive. The second bonus became effective July 1, 1918, and the amount was \$120. The third bonus became effective July 1, 1919. The amount was \$240. The bonus of \$240 was continued until July 1, 1924, when the reclassification act took effect.

In 1913 the minimum salary paid a full-time clerical worker in the District of Columbia was \$900 in some departments and \$1,000 in others. The table which follows will show what happened to the salary of a \$900 clerk from 1913 to 1931.

Column 1 shows the year.

Column 2 gives the index number; that is, the cost of living for the year compared with the same cost in 1913.

Column 3 shows the salary necessary to equal the salary of 1913 in purchasing power.

Column 4 gives the actual salary received by this \$900 clerk during the year.

Column 5 shows the salary lag, or loss in pay for the year.

Column 6 shows the value of the dollar or its purchasing power for the year.

Column 7 shows the real wage for each year when compared with the purchasing power of the dollar in 1913.

Note.—Fractional parts of the dollar when less than one-half have been disregarded, and if one-half or more have been treated as a dollar; fractional parts of the cent have been treated in the same way.

TABLE I.—Showing what happened in the pay envelope of a \$900 clerk from 1913 to 1924; also what should have happened but did not happen

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Year	Index number for cost of living	Index value of \$900 salary	Actual salary received	Salary lag or loss	Value of \$1	Real wage
1913.....	100.0	\$900.00	\$900.00	-----	\$1.00	\$900.00
1914.....	103.0	927.00	900.00	\$27.00	.97	873.00
1915.....	105.1	946.00	900.00	46.00	.95	855.00
1916.....	118.3	1,055.00	900.00	155.00	.85	765.00
1917.....	142.4	1,282.00	900.00	382.00	.70	630.00
1918.....	174.4	1,579.00	990.00	589.00	.57	564.00
1919.....	199.4	1,795.00	1,020.00	775.00	.50	510.00
1920.....	200.4	1,804.00	1,140.00	664.00	.50	570.00
1921.....	174.3	1,569.00	1,140.00	429.00	.57	650.00
1922.....	169.5	1,526.00	1,140.00	386.00	.59	673.00
1923.....	173.2	1,559.00	1,140.00	419.00	.58	661.00
1924.....	172.5	1,553.00	1,140.00	413.00	.58	661.00
Total.....		15,596.00	11,310.00	4,286.00		7,412.00
Average.....		1,418.00	1,028.00	390.00		674.00

Owing to the increase in the cost of living from 1913 to 1924, inclusive, this \$900 clerk, to keep even with the additional cost, should have received each year the amount given in column 3 for the year; but he did not get it, he only received the amount given in column 4 for the year. His total salary lag, or loss, for the 11 years was \$4,286, or an average annual lag, or loss, of \$390.

If this employee had received a salary of \$900 a year during this 11-year period, his total salary would have been \$9,900; and if the purchasing power of the dollar had remained constant, his real wage would also have been \$9,900. However, owing to the fluctuation in the purchasing power of the dollar, his real wage for this period of 11 years, measured in 1913 dollars, was only \$7,412, or an average annual salary of only \$674. His pay was thus reduced below that of a junior messenger, \$720, and for three years was below that of a laborer in 1913. His actual salary loss during this period of 11 years was \$2,488, or an average annual loss of \$226, and these were "big dollars," not "little dollars."

AFTER RECLASSIFICATION

The classification act, which became effective July 1, 1924, abolished the statutory salary of this \$900 clerk; but his position was not lost, it was simply transferred to grade 1, clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, and the salary, \$1,140, became the entrance salary of the grade. This salary remained the minimum wage for clerical workers until July 1, 1928, when the Welch Act became effective, and the minimum salary of a clerical worker was raised to \$1,260, and this salary is merely the old statutory salary of \$1,000, plus the bonus of \$240, plus \$20.

TABLE II.—Showing what happened in the pay envelope of a \$900 clerk from 1925 to 1931; also what should have happened but did not happen

Year	Index number for cost of living	Index value of \$900 salary	Salary received	Salary lag or loss	Value of \$1	Real wage
1925	177.9	\$1,601.00	\$1,140.00	\$471.00	\$0.56	\$638.00
1926	175.6	1,580.00	1,140.00	440.00	.57	650.00
1927	172.0	1,548.00	1,140.00	408.00	.58	661.00
1928	171.3	1,542.00	1,140.00	402.00	.58	661.00
1929	171.4	1,543.00	1,200.00	283.00	.58	731.00
1930	160.7	1,446.00	1,260.00	186.00	.62	781.00
1931	145.8	1,312.00	1,260.00	52.00	.69	869.00
Total		10,572.00	8,340.00	2,232.00		4,991.00
Average		1,510.00	1,191.00	319.00		713.00

Summary

Total salary lag, 1914 to 1924	\$4,286
Total salary lag, 1925 to 1931	2,232
Total salary lag, 1914 to 1931	6,518
Average annual salary lag	362
Total real wage, 1914 to 1924	7,412
Total real wage, 1925 to 1931	4,991
Total real wage, 1914 to 1931	12,403
Average annual real wage	689
Total salary for 18 years, at \$900 a year	16,200
Total real wage received	12,403
Total loss in real wage	3,797
Average annual loss in real wage	211

COMMENT

A study of the tables, given above, will show that the real wage of this \$900 clerk dropped to \$510 in 1919; that for three years it was below that of a laborer in 1913; and that the average annual real wage for the whole period of 18 years was below that paid to a junior messenger (\$720) in 1913.

Moreover, what happened to this \$900 salary, in loss of purchasing power, also happened to every other statutory salary paid by the Government during this period. The salary lag, or loss in real wages, of all the employees in the Government service during these 18 years is so vast a sum that it is seemingly unbelievable, and one hesitates to even estimate the amount.

Table showing the Government index number for the cost of living from 1913 to 1931, inclusive; also the purchasing power of \$1 during each year compared with the purchasing power of \$1 in 1913

Year	Index number for cost of living	Purchasing power of \$1 compared with 1913
1913	100.0	\$1.00
1914	103.0	.97
1915	105.1	.95
1916	118.3	.85
1917	142.4	.70
1918	174.4	.57
1919	198.4	.50
1920	200.4	.50
1921	174.3	.57
1922	169.5	.59

Table showing the Government index number for the cost of living from 1913 to 1931, inclusive; also the purchasing power of \$1 during each year compared with the purchasing power of \$1 in 1913—Continued

Year	Index number for cost of living	Purchasing power of \$1 compared with 1913
1923	173.2	\$0.58
1924	172.5	.58
1925	177.9	.56
1926	175.6	.57
1927	172.0	.58
1928	171.3	.58
1929	171.4	.58
1930	160.7	.62
1931	150.3	.66
1932	145.8	.69

The index number is easily understood; for example, the number for 1927 is 172. This merely indicates that the items costing \$1.72 in 1927 could have been purchased in 1913 for \$1. The cost of living in 1927 was 72 per cent above the cost of living in 1913.

In computing the purchasing power of the dollar in this table fractional parts of the cent less than one-half were ignored; if the fractional part was one-half cent or over, it was called 1 cent.

The Department of Labor prepares its index numbers in June and December of each year. The December index is given in the table except for 1931, when both are given; the first is for June and the last for December.

TABLE III.—Applying the Government's index number for cost of living to the salary of \$1,000, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1	2	3	4	5
Year	Index value of \$1,000 salary	Actual salary received	Salary lag or loss	Real wage
1913	\$1,000	\$1,000		\$1,000
1914	1,030	1,000	\$30	970
1915	1,051	1,000	51	950
1916	1,183	1,000	183	850
1917	1,424	1,000	424	700
1918	1,744	1,100	644	627
1919	1,984	1,120	874	560
1920	2,004	1,240	764	620
1921	1,743	1,240	503	707
1922	1,695	1,240	455	732
1923	1,732	1,240	492	719
1924	1,725	1,240	485	719
Total	17,325	12,420	4,905	8,154
Average	1,575	1,129	446	741

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924	\$17,325
Total actual salary received, 1914 to 1924	12,420
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924	4,905
Average annual salary lag or loss	446
Total salary for 11 years, at \$1,000 a year	11,000
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924	8,154
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924	2,846
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924	259
Average annual wage, 1914 to 1924	741

COMMENT

If the Government had enacted a law in 1913 and established a statutory salary of \$1,000 for this position, and at the same time had added a provision to the law that the salary should be raised or lowered according to the increase or decrease in the cost of living as shown by the Government's own index number prepared to show the fluctuations in the cost of living, the Government would have placed in the pay envelope of the employee occupying this \$1,000 year by year the amounts given in column 2. But, unfortunately, there was no such provision in the law, so the employee actually received the amounts shown in column 3. The salary lag, or loss, is shown in column 4; this represents the additional sum that should have gone into the pay envelope to keep the purchasing power at \$1,000. If the cost of living had remained the same as in 1913 during each year from 1913 to 1924, the nominal wage and the real wage for this position would also have remained the same—\$1,000; but owing to the fluctuations in the purchasing power in the dollar, the real wage received, measured by the purchasing power of the dollar in 1913, was as shown in column 5.

The table further shows that during the period covered by the study, 1914 to 1924, the \$1,000 clerk received the pay of a junior messenger in 1913, or a trifle more.

For the Government's index number for the cost of living and the value of the dollar year by year since 1913 see Table 1, "Salary of \$900 clerk."

TABLE IV.—Applying the Government's index cost of living to the salary of \$1,200, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1	2	3	4	5
Year	Index value of \$1,200 salary	Actual salary received	Salary lag or salary loss	Real wage
1913.....	\$1,200	\$1,200	-----	\$1,200
1914.....	1,236	1,200	\$36	1,164
1915.....	1,261	1,200	61	1,140
1916.....	1,420	1,200	220	1,020
1917.....	1,709	1,200	509	840
1918.....	2,093	1,200	893	718
1919.....	2,393	1,320	1,073	660
1920.....	2,405	1,440	965	720
1921.....	2,092	1,440	652	821
1922.....	2,034	1,440	594	850
1923.....	2,078	1,440	638	835
1924.....	2,070	1,440	630	825
Total.....	20,791	14,580	6,211	9,603
Average.....	1,890	1,325	564	873

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$20,791
Total actual salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	14,580
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	6,211
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	564
Total salary for 11 years at \$1,200 a year.....	13,200
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	9,603
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	3,599
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	327
Average annual real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	873

COMMENT

It will be noted that the pay of a \$1,200 clerk was reduced in purchasing power during the whole period from 1914 to 1924 to approximately that of a senior messenger in 1913 (\$840); that from 1917 on it was below that of a senior messenger; that in 1918 to 1921 it was at or below that of a junior messenger; and in 1919 it was just a little above that of a laborer in 1913.

Many able employees were had at this salary during this period, and they performed highly important work.

For the Government's index number for the cost of living and the value of the dollar, year by year since 1913, on Table 1, \$900 clerk.

TABLE V.—Applying the Government's index number for cost of living to the salary of \$1,400, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1	2	3	4	5
Year	Index value of \$1,400 salary	Actual salary received	Salary lag or loss	Real wage
1913.....	\$1,400	\$1,400	-----	\$1,400
1914.....	1,442	1,400	\$42	1,358
1915.....	1,471	1,400	71	1,330
1916.....	1,656	1,400	256	1,190
1917.....	1,994	1,400	594	980
1918.....	2,442	1,470	972	838
1919.....	2,792	1,520	1,272	760
1920.....	2,806	1,640	1,166	820
1921.....	2,440	1,640	800	935
1922.....	2,373	1,640	733	968
1923.....	2,425	1,640	785	951
1924.....	2,415	1,640	775	951
Total.....	24,256	16,790	7,466	11,081
Average.....	2,205	1,526	679	1,007

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$24,256
Total actual salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	16,790
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	7,466
Average annual salary lag or loss.....	679
Total salary for 11 years, at \$1,400.....	15,400
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	11,081
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	4,319
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	393
Average annual real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	1,007

COMMENT

The salary of the \$1,400 clerk dropped down in purchasing power below that of a senior messenger in 1913, in the years 1918, 1919, and 1920; and the salary he received during the whole period of 11 years was equal in purchasing power to the salary of a \$1,000 clerk in 1913.

For the Government's index number for the cost of living and the value of the dollar, year by year since 1913, see Table 1, salary of \$900 clerk.

TABLE VI.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the \$1,600 salary, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1	2	3	4	5
Year	Index value of \$1,600 salary	Actual salary received	Salary lag or loss	Real wage
1913.....	\$1,600	\$1,600	-----	\$1,600
1914.....	1,648	1,600	\$48	1,552
1915.....	1,682	1,600	82	1,520
1916.....	1,893	1,600	293	1,360
1917.....	2,278	1,600	678	1,120
1918.....	2,790	1,680	1,110	958
1919.....	3,140	1,720	1,420	860
1920.....	3,206	1,840	1,366	920
1921.....	2,789	1,840	949	1,049
1922.....	2,712	1,840	872	1,086
1923.....	2,771	1,840	931	1,067
1924.....	2,760	1,840	920	1,067
Total.....	27,669	19,000	8,669	12,559
Average.....	2,515	1,727	788	1,142

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$27,669
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	19,000
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	8,669
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	788
Total salary for 11 years at \$1,600 a year.....	17,600
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	12,559
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	5,041
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	453
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	1,142

COMMENT

The above table shows that from 1914 to 1924 an employee with the salary of \$1,600 with the bonus added received in real pay less than a \$1,200 clerk received in 1913. True, he received more dollars, but the purchasing power of these dollars was so reduced that he was not even a \$1,200 clerk, measured by the purchasing power of the dollar in 1913. Attention is invited to the "real wage" from 1918 to 1920, inclusive. During this period a \$1,600 clerk was an important factor in the clerical work of the Government, many of the section chiefs and supervisors being in this class.

TABLE VII.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$1,800, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1	2	3	4	5
Year	Index value of \$1,800 salary	Actual salary received	Salary lag or loss	Real wage
1913.....	\$1,800	\$1,800	-----	\$1,800
1914.....	1,854	1,800	\$54	1,746
1915.....	1,892	1,800	92	1,710
1916.....	2,129	1,800	329	1,530
1917.....	2,563	1,800	763	1,260
1918.....	3,130	1,890	1,240	1,077
1919.....	3,589	1,920	1,669	960
1920.....	3,607	2,040	1,567	1,020
1921.....	3,137	2,040	1,097	1,163
1922.....	3,051	2,040	1,011	1,204
1923.....	3,118	2,040	1,078	1,183
1924.....	3,105	2,040	1,065	1,183
Total.....	31,184	21,210	9,974	14,036
Average.....	2,835	1,928	907	1,276

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$31,184
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	21,210
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	9,974
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	907
Total salary for 11 years, at \$1,800 a year.....	19,800
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	14,036
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	5,764
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	524
Average real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	1,276

COMMENT

In the \$1,800 class were section chiefs, assistant chiefs of division, and other employees holding important and key positions. Attention is invited to their real wage from 1917 on. No wonder women hunted for a "job"; one bread-winner could not earn enough to support a family.

TABLE VIII.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$2,000, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1 Year	2 Index value of \$2,000 salary	3 Actual salary received	4 Salary lag or loss	5 Real wage
1913.....	\$2,000	\$2,000	-----	\$2,000
1914.....	2,060	2,000	\$60	1,940
1915.....	2,102	2,000	102	1,900
1916.....	2,366	2,000	366	1,700
1917.....	2,848	2,000	848	1,400
1918.....	3,488	2,000	1,488	1,140
1919.....	3,988	2,120	1,868	1,060
1920.....	4,008	2,240	1,768	1,120
1921.....	3,496	2,240	1,246	1,277
1922.....	3,390	2,240	1,150	1,322
1923.....	3,464	2,240	1,224	1,289
1924.....	3,450	2,240	1,210	1,299
Total.....	34,650	23,320	11,330	15,457
Average.....	3,150	2,120	1,050	1,405

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$34,650
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	23,320
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	11,330
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	1,050
Total salary for 11 years at \$2,000 a year.....	22,000
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	15,457
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	6,543
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	595
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	1,405

COMMENT

Employees in the \$2,000 class were assistant chiefs and chiefs of divisions or were important key men in their bureaus. It will be noted that the salaries of these chiefs and key men dropped to \$1,060 in purchasing power in 1919, and that their average annual real wage was only \$1,405 for the whole 11 years, measured by the purchasing power in 1913.

TABLE IX.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$2,250, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1 Year	2 Index value of \$2,250 salary	3 Actual salary received	4 Salary lag or loss	5 Real wage
1913.....	\$2,250	\$2,250	-----	\$2,250
1914.....	2,318	2,250	\$68	2,183
1915.....	2,365	2,250	115	2,133
1916.....	2,662	2,250	412	1,913
1917.....	3,204	2,250	954	1,575
1918.....	3,924	2,250	1,674	1,283
1919.....	4,487	2,370	2,117	1,185
1920.....	4,509	2,490	2,019	1,245
1921.....	3,922	2,490	1,432	1,419
1922.....	3,814	2,490	1,324	1,469
1923.....	3,897	2,490	1,407	1,444
1924.....	3,881	2,490	1,391	1,444
Total.....	38,983	26,070	12,913	17,298
Average.....	3,544	2,370	1,174	1,573

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$38,983
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	26,070
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	12,913
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	1,174
Total salary for 11 years at \$2,250 a year.....	24,750
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	17,298
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	7,452
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	677
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	1,573

COMMENT

Employees in this class were chiefs of important divisions, assistant chief clerks of bureaus, or held technical or professional positions. It will be noted that their average real wage during the period from 1914 to 1924, inclusive, had less purchasing power than that of the \$1,600 clerk in 1913. Attention is called to their real wage for 1918, 1919, 1920.

TABLE X.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$2,500, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1 Year	2 Index value of \$2,500 salary	3 Actual salary received	4 Salary lag or loss	5 Real wage
1913.....	\$2,500	\$2,500	-----	\$2,500
1914.....	2,575	2,500	\$75	2,425
1915.....	2,628	2,500	128	2,375
1916.....	2,958	2,500	458	2,125
1917.....	3,560	2,500	1,060	1,750
1918.....	4,360	2,500	1,860	1,425
1919.....	4,985	2,620	2,365	1,312
1920.....	5,010	2,740	2,270	1,370
1921.....	4,358	2,740	1,618	1,562
1922.....	4,238	2,740	1,498	1,617
1923.....	4,330	2,740	1,590	1,589
1924.....	4,313	2,740	1,573	1,589
Total.....	43,315	28,820	14,495	19,139
Average.....	3,938	2,620	1,318	1,740

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$43,315
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	28,820
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	14,495
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	1,318
Total salary for 11 years at \$2,500 a year.....	27,500
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	19,139
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	8,361
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	760
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	1,740

COMMENT

Employees in the \$2,500 class were chief clerks of bureaus, or held other positions of similar importance. It will be noted that their average annual real wage had less purchasing power than that of an \$1,800 clerk in 1913.

TABLE XI.—Applying to the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$3,000, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1 Year	2 Index value of \$3,000 salary	3 Actual salary received	4 Salary lag or loss	5 Real wage
1913.....	\$3,000	\$3,000	-----	\$3,000
1914.....	3,060	3,000	\$60	2,910
1915.....	3,153	3,000	153	2,850
1916.....	3,549	3,000	549	2,550
1917.....	4,272	3,000	1,272	2,100
1918.....	5,232	3,000	2,232	1,710
1919.....	5,982	3,000	2,982	1,500
1920.....	6,012	3,000	3,012	1,500
1921.....	5,229	3,000	2,229	1,710
1922.....	5,085	3,000	2,085	1,770
1923.....	5,196	3,000	2,196	1,740
1924.....	5,175	3,000	2,175	1,740
Total.....	51,975	33,000	18,975	22,080
Average.....	4,725	3,000	1,725	2,007

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$51,975
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	33,000
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	18,975
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	1,725
Total salary for 11 years at \$3,000 a year.....	33,000
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	19,139
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	13,861
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	1,260
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	2,007

COMMENT

Employees in the \$3,000 class were largely in administrative, scientific, and technical services. Obviously, their work was regarded as highly important. These employees did not receive a bonus at any time. Attention is called to the purchasing power of the \$3,000 salary from 1918 on.

TABLE XII.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$3,600, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1 Years	2 Index value of \$3,600 salary	3 Actual salary received	4 Salary lag or loss	5 Real wage
1913.....	\$3,600	\$3,600	-----	\$3,600
1914.....	3,708	3,600	\$108	3,492
1915.....	3,783	3,600	183	3,420
1916.....	4,259	3,600	659	3,060
1917.....	5,126	3,600	1,526	2,520
1918.....	6,278	3,600	2,678	2,052
1919.....	7,178	3,600	3,578	1,800
1920.....	7,214	3,600	3,614	1,800
1921.....	6,275	3,600	2,675	2,052
1922.....	6,102	3,600	2,502	2,124
1923.....	6,235	3,600	2,635	2,088
1924.....	6,210	3,600	2,610	2,088
Total.....	62,398	39,600	22,768	26,496
Average.....	5,670	3,600	2,070	2,409

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$62,368
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	39,600
Total salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	22,768
Average annual salary lag or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	2,070
Total salary for 11 years, at \$3,600 a year.....	39,600
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	26,496
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	13,600
Average annual loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	1,191
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	2,409

COMMENT

Employees in the \$3,600 class were assistant chiefs of bureaus, revenue agents, and other administrative officials. It is always proper to scan column 5 to see what the real wage was from 1913 to 1924.

TABLE XIII.—Applying the Government's index number for the cost of living to the salary of \$5,000, covering the period from 1913 to 1924

1 Years	2 Index value of \$5,000 salary	3 Salary actually received	4 Salary lag or loss	5 Real wage
1913.....	\$5,000	\$5,000	-----	\$5,000
1914.....	5,150	5,000	\$150	4,850
1915.....	5,255	5,000	255	4,750
1916.....	5,915	5,000	915	4,250
1917.....	7,120	5,000	2,120	3,500
1918.....	8,720	5,000	3,720	2,850
1919.....	9,970	5,000	4,970	2,500
1920.....	10,020	5,000	5,020	2,500
1921.....	8,715	5,000	3,715	2,850
1922.....	8,475	5,000	3,475	2,950
1923.....	8,660	5,000	3,660	2,900
1924.....	8,625	5,000	3,625	2,900
Total.....	86,625	55,000	31,625	36,800
Average.....	7,875	5,000	2,875	3,345

Summary

Total index value of salary, 1914 to 1924.....	\$86,625
Total salary received, 1914 to 1924.....	55,000
Total salary lag, or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	31,625
Average annual salary lag, or loss, 1914 to 1924.....	2,875
Total salary for 11 years, at \$5,000 a year.....	55,000
Total real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	36,800
Total loss in real wage, 1914 to 1924.....	18,200
Average annual loss in real wages, 1914 to 1924.....	1,655
Average real wage received, 1914 to 1924.....	3,345

COMMENT

Employees in the \$5,000 were heads of bureaus and other high officials of the Government. The real wage in their salaries, measured against the purchasing power of the \$5,000 in 1913, was remarkably small from 1918 to 1924. It is evident that the reclassification act of 1923 was due years before it was enacted.

REHABILITATION OF AGRICULTURE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, and suggests that it be indefinitely postponed, because the matter therein

referred to has been taken care of. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 210) submitted by Mr. HOWELL on May 9, 1932, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate request the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry immediately to report a measure or measures having for its or their purpose the constructive rehabilitation of agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills referred to in the resolution having been reported, the Chair suggests that the resolution be indefinitely postponed. Without objection, that order will be made.

CONSOLIDATION OF STANDARD OIL COS. OF NEW JERSEY AND CALIFORNIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 216) submitted by Mr. WHEELER on May 20, 1932, as follows:

Whereas the officers and directors of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Standard Oil Co. of California are reported to be seeking to consolidate these two companies into one organization, notwithstanding the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and notwithstanding the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Attorney General of the United States is requested to advise the Senate what, if any, action his department has taken or intends to take with a view to preventing the consolidation of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the resolution just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the Senator who submitted the resolution is not now present.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In the absence of my colleague [Mr. WHEELER], who submitted the resolution, I ask that it may go over without prejudice.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order is made.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 218) submitted by Mr. TYDINGS on May 30, 1932, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate as soon as possible the following information, to wit:

(a) As of May 31, 1932, the amount of revenue, by item, which the rates contained in the revenue bill, at the time of its presentation to the Senate by the Finance Committee, will raise.

(b) The amount of revenue by item said rates will raise as amended by the Senate up to the present time.

(c) The amount of revenue, if any, now required in addition to that estimated in paragraph (b) as necessary to balance the Budget, with contemplated economies and without provision for debt retirement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the information called for by the resolution has been furnished.

Mr. TYDINGS. The occasion for the resolution having passed, I ask that it may be withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

COSTS OF MEAT CHOPPERS, OPTICAL AND DRAWING INSTRUMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 219) submitted by Mr. REED on May 9 (calendar day, May 31), 1932, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby authorized and directed to investigate, for the purpose of section 336 (Title III, special provisions) of the tariff act of 1930, the differences in the cost of production between the domestic article or articles and the competitive foreign article or articles, and to report at the earliest practicable date, on the following items:

1. Meat or food choppers, classified for duty under paragraph 335 as kitchen utensils or under paragraph 372 as machines; together with replacement parts, classified under paragraph 356 as cutting

knives, under paragraph 372 as parts of machines, or under paragraph 397 as manufactures of metal.

2. Optical instruments as described in paragraph 228(a) (b).

3. Drawing instruments, classified for duty under paragraph 360, and other scientific and laboratory apparatus and instruments as described in the same paragraph.

Mr. REED. That is merely the usual request for the Tariff Commission to make a study and report. I hope the resolution may be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What are the commodities to be investigated?

Mr. REED. The two latter clauses of the resolution are important from the standpoint of the national defense. The manufacture in this country of the products referred to is attended with considerable difficulty, and is conducted by comparatively few firms, which are not very prosperous.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It has been found necessary, Mr. President, to abandon some very important investigations to be conducted by the Federal Trade Commission in order to carry out the program of economy which is in contemplation, if not in progress. I was wondering whether the Tariff Commission will be equipped with the funds to prosecute the investigations here suggested?

Mr. REED. I think so. The investigations are comparatively simple. The number of firms in this country, as I say, which produce these articles is very limited. The number of firms abroad that compete here is also comparatively limited.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Can the Senator tell us how well supplied with funds the Tariff Commission will be to carry on its regular work?

Mr. REED. I do not know how their appropriations for this year compare with those for last year, but I do know that they have experts on their regular staff who are fully qualified to make this investigation. They have already made a large part of it, and are thoroughly familiar with the competitive situation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But if the retrenchment program shall be carried out, it will be necessary to discharge quite a considerable number of the experts, will it not?

Mr. REED. It will doubtless be necessary to discharge some of them, but not all of them. I do not think the investigation will cost very much money.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I assume that it is in contemplation that the investigation will show the inadequacy of existing rates and result in recommendations for increased rates.

Mr. REED. I am not sure of that. The manufacturers of this country claim that to be so, but I am not competent to say whether their claims are correct or not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the rate on optical instruments as described in paragraph 228?

Mr. REED. I do not remember; I can look it up and tell the Senator. What is the paragraph number?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Two hundred and twenty-eight (b).

Mr. REED. I will tell the Senator in a moment; it is pretty hard to carry the figures in one's mind.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I realize that.

Mr. REED. I have the figures right here.

Mr. KING. What section is it?

Mr. REED. In section 228 (b) the rate is 45 per cent ad valorem and on optical testing instruments the rate is 60 per cent.

What I am particularly concerned in now are fire-control instruments of the type that are used by our Army and Navy. We had a very difficult time at the beginning of the World War in making those instruments in this country, and we do not want to get back into that position again. We are still making a few of them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

Mr. KING. I do not want to be critical; but we are frequently importuned to increase tariff duties, though we have a substantial monopoly of the commodity for which the increase is sought, upon the ground that the national defense calls for such action. A few days ago we were asked in a very eloquent speech by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], because of the national defense, to put a higher tariff duty upon a certain mineral.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. It was not only in the interest of national defense that the request was made, though that was one of the arguments used in favor of the tariff rate proposed.

Mr. KING. I understand that there is a sort of duality running through these requests for increased tariff duties—first, the national defense, and, second, to furnish employment to American workingmen—but usually back of it, of course, is a desire for increased monopoly.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is a work of futility to obtain information from the Tariff Commission now, even if they were able to furnish accurate information in regard to all of the prices at home and abroad, in view of the so-called depreciated currencies and the fluctuations in the industrial and economic field at home as well as in the industrial and economic field abroad. It is like the valuation of the railroads; it changes every day. Railroad stocks of two or three years ago or a week ago or even perhaps yesterday would not show the same valuation to-day.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I will yield in a moment. It seems to me it is just like trying to measure the tide as it comes in and out. At a particular moment when the tide is measured it shows a certain height, but in a few minutes it has changed. It is exactly the same with the commodities produced at home and produced abroad. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. The fire-control instruments of which I speak are principally made in France and Germany, neither of which is troubled at the moment by depreciated currency; so that factor will not enter into the consideration.

I want to assure the Senator that I am not masquerading a tariff claim for my State behind some matter of national defense. There is not a single one of these articles, so far as I know, made in the State of Pennsylvania and there never has been. Their manufacture, so far as I am aware, is limited entirely to Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. KING. The Senator is now referring to optical instruments.

Mr. REED. Yes; to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution.

Mr. KING. And not to meat choppers?

Mr. REED. As to meat choppers the situation is entirely different. There is one concern struggling along in Philadelphia with a cost of production for a typical meat chopper of 67 cents, while meat choppers are being brought in from Germany duty paid and profit paid to the importer and being sold at retail for 50 cents. There is something wrong there. The local manufacturers tried to cut their costs; they have reduced wages several times; but evidently the manufacturer in Germany is either dumping or else he has some mysteriously low cost.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the evidence before the Tariff Commission and before the Senate reveals the fact that in the case of thousands, and hundreds of thousands for that matter, of commodities produced in the United States we can compete successfully with other nations but we have been in the habit of permitting such resolutions as this to go through and I shall not object although I state again that it will be a work of futility to obtain any information at the present time.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief explanation, inasmuch as there has been brought into the dis-

cussion a statement I made the other day in regard to an increase in the tariff on manganese. I am not asking that this matter be brought up now, but I want to make clear my position, that I favor American industry against a monopoly from Soviet Russia. I think American industry and the American people are entitled to more consideration at the present time than are the industries of Soviet Russia, and I made the effort I did in behalf of an increased duty on manganese, Mr. President, in the interest of the industry throughout the United States, and not just for my own State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration, under Rule VIII, of the calendar of unobjected bills, commencing with Order of Business No. 104.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon when we are going to have another morning hour. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this is the first we have had since the 9th of May, and that there are a great many exceedingly important measures on the calendar. Of course, the unobjected bills are apt to be the least important measures on the calendar. I merely inquire of the Senator what the chances are in that respect.

Mr. McNARY. I am in sympathy with the suggestion of the able Senator, and I can say that we will have two calendar mornings during the week in addition to the present one.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the number of the order of business at which the Senator from Oregon desires to begin the consideration of the calendar?

Mr. McNARY. Order of Business No. 104, the first number on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 88) to authorize the Postmaster General to investigate the conditions of the lease of the post-office garage in Boston, Mass., and to readjust the terms thereof, was announced as first in order.

Mr. BLAINE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 268) to amend subdivision (c) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2642) to establish a commission to be known as a commission on a national museum of engineering and industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the President to reorganize the executive agencies of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Economy Committee of the Appropriations Committee has reported a similar measure. This is the George resolution. I call the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1856) to provide for the relief of farmers in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, irrigation, and/or similar districts other than Federal reclamation projects, or to

counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROSCOE MEADOWS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2375) for the relief of Roscoe Meadows, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That in the administration of the emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928, Roscoe McKinley Meadows shall be held and considered to have served as an officer of the Navy of the United States during the World War other than as an officer of the regular Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows."

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 166) to print the pamphlets entitled "Draft of Mooney-Billings Report" and "Appendix Containing Official Documents" was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the resolution go over.

COMPENSATION AND MILEAGE OF MEMBERS OF AND DELEGATES TO CONGRESS

The bill (S. 2494) to amend section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, passed and approved March 4, 1925, relating to the compensation of Members of and Delegates to Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that subject matter is covered by the economy bill, and I ask that this bill may be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2495) to repeal section 17 of the act passed and approved July 28, 1866, relating to mileage of Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BORAH. I ask that that be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho referred to Senate bill 2494 as having been taken care of by the Economy Committee. Senate bill 2495 has been taken care of by the Economy Committee, too—both of them.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Economy Committee dealt with the question of mileage?

Mr. DALE. Yes, Mr. President; the mileage has been cut in the bill.

Mr. BORAH. To what extent?

Mr. DALE. One-fourth.

Mr. BORAH. I can deal with the matter by way of amendment. I ask that Senate bill 2495 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

LAWRENCE L. MYATT AND MILLER S. BURGIN

The bill (S. 3051) to reinstate Lawrence L. Myatt and Miller S. Burgin as midshipmen in the United States Naval Academy was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that that bill be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

HOSPITAL ON CROW INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (S. 276) for the construction and equipment of a hospital on Crow Indian Reservation was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not know who it was that suggested that the bill go over, but I will say that Senate bill 276 and Senate bill 2987 are authorizations for the completion of two small hospitals, one on the Crow Indian Reservation and the other one on the Blackfeet

Indian Reservation. The department says they are very much in need of these two hospitals. The only reason that the department suggested for not recommending them was on account of the financial condition at the present time. I have not the report that was made by the committee, but these are merely authorizations and not appropriations.

Mr. REED. Yes; I understand, Mr. President; but what prompted me to object was the letter from the Indian Commissioner saying this:

We must consider, in the order of priority, the needs of the service as a whole, giving special attention to Indian groups who are not now provided with hospital or medical facilities. While we are sympathetic to the needs on the Crow Reservation, in view of the foregoing, we are unable to recommend the enactment of S. 276 at this time.

Why is not that a sound objection?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if that is a sound objection, there never would be any hospitals on some of the reservations where they are needed, just because of the fact that somebody has not recommended them. A hospital is needed on the Crow Reservation, and one is needed on the Blackfeet Reservation. These are merely authorizations, not appropriations; and the Indians on these reservations are desperately in need of these hospital facilities.

Mr. REED. But they already have hospitals there.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator had ever seen the hospitals that they have, he would realize that they are old, antiquated, just old junk; as a matter of fact, just old buildings that are not properly equipped for hospital service. The Indians on both of these reservations have no place where their tubercular subjects can be properly treated. They have no place except these old, worn-out buildings. No physician would think of sending a patient to these hospitals.

Mr. REED. Part of the Crow Reservation hospital was built in 1908. The main building was built in 1916. That does not sound old and antiquated.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not only old and antiquated, but it is insufficient to take care of the Indians that are there. This is just an authorization. When the question of appropriation comes up I will go into the matter further with the Senator; but I hope he will not object to these two authorizations at this time.

Mr. REED. I do not know enough about the subject to stand here and block these bills indefinitely. If some one who is familiar with the needs of the Indians, as I know the Senator is, insists that these hospitals are needed, and no one else familiar with the needs of the Indians objects, I am not going to persist in my objection.

Mr. WHEELER. The whole committee has gone out there and investigated this matter, and the full committee has recommended the construction of the hospital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$120,000 for the construction and equipping of a hospital at Crow Agency on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

HOSPITAL ON BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The bill (S. 2987) providing for the construction and equipment of a hospital upon the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the construction of a modern 50-bed hospital, fully equipped, upon the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in the State of Montana.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3323) to provide funds for cooperation with the school district at Nespelem, Wash., in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children

of the Colville Indian Reservation was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3696) to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3377) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9642) to authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction with a view to increasing employment was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 15) to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals, in the State of Alabama, to authorize the letting of the Muscle Shoals properties under certain conditions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 572) to provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the general health of the rural population of the United States and the welfare and hygiene of mothers and children was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT OF ESPIONAGE, ETC.

The bill (S. 1058) repealing various provisions of the act of June 15, 1917, entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes" (40 Stat. L. 217), was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will withdraw his objection to that bill. It has already passed the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, so many people have entered objections to the bill that I think it ought to be pretty well considered before it is passed; and I do not believe we can do it in the short time that is available this morning.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It passed the Senate a year ago without the slightest objection from anybody.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, does the Senator realize that there were put in the Record the other day the requests of two different organizations that they be given a hearing on this bill? Will not the Senator ask to have the bill sent back to the committee so that they may be heard?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should not like to do that. The bill has been before the committee now for more than two years.

Mr. BINGHAM. They claim that they have not had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is not the case, Mr. President. They have had every opportunity to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 97) to protect trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this appears to be an important bill. I do not desire to object to its consideration; but I should like to have a discussion of its provisions by the author, or by the Senator who reported the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the bill may go over. An important bill like this ought not to be taken up under the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish equipment, goods, and supplies to governors and acting governors for use in aid of distressed citizens was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

BOARD OF INDETERMINATE SENTENCE AND PAROLE

The bill (S. 1155) to establish a board of indeterminate sentence and parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] give me his attention? This is a bill providing for the establishment of a parole board. I was wondering if the conditions now call for this legislation.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, they certainly do. There is no bill before the committee that has been more thoroughly considered and has more general approval of those who are charged with the responsibility of this particular activity in the District of Columbia than this measure. It is urged by the District Commissioners, and comes here with the approval of the Budget Bureau. It was very carefully gone over by the corporation counsel, and its passage is particularly desired by the director of the Bureau of Prisons, and it has had his careful examination.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I find that the bill provides a number of salaries, and also authorizes the payment of traveling expenses. I should like to be informed as to the amount which it will cost.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPPER. The Senator from Vermont reported the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand that the bill under consideration is Senate bill 1155.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. AUSTIN. No salaries at all are carried in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator is mistaken about that. There is no appropriation for salaries, but there are authorizations for salaries. Here is the language on page 3:

Salaries and the actual and necessary traveling expenses of each such parole officer shall be paid out of the appropriation for the maintenance of the penal institution to which he is assigned and receive compensation in accordance with the rates established by the personnel classification act of 1923. (All other necessary expenses incurred in the administration of this act shall be paid out of the appropriations for the penal institutions from which prisoners are paroled, and such appropriations are hereby made available therefor.)

What I am inquiring is, How much is this bill going to cost?

Mr. AUSTIN. I could not answer that question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let the bill go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1039) establishing additional land offices in the States of Montana, Oregon, South Dakota, Idaho, New Mexico, Colorado, and Nevada was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to authorize the merger

of street-railway corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLAINE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

RALPH E. WILLIAMSON

The bill (S. 2458) for the relief of Ralph E. Williamson for loss suffered on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. COOLIDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will withhold his objection for a moment I would like to state to him that a bill for the relief of others who suffered losses in the fire referred to in this measure was passed in the Seventieth Congress, but the name of Ralph E. Williamson was inadvertently omitted from the list of the claimants. Twenty-one other claimants have been paid on the same basis on which relief is asked in this case, and therefore the committee has reported this bill for the relief of Mr. Williamson.

We have an affidavit from the claimant stating that he did not receive any insurance on account of this fire. As I stated, 21 other claimants have been paid, and the committee unanimously favor paying Mr. Williamson \$565. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. KING. I withdraw my objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$565 to Ralph E. Williamson, as compensation in full for loss of property destroyed by the fire on September 24, 1917, in the city of Lawton, Okla., such loss having been the result of the inability of the fire department of the city of Lawton to control said fire because of lack of water, all available water for fire-fighting purposes having been appropriated and being used by the War Department in connection with the training of soldiers at Fort Sill and Camp Doniphan: *Provided,* That before said claim is allowed and paid the Comptroller General of the United States shall make an investigation of said claim to determine the extent and amount of such loss and damage, and such claim shall be adjusted in amount not in excess of the difference between insurance paid, if any, and the amount set out herein and upon certificates issued to said claimant by the said Comptroller General of the United States.

LOANS TO VETERANS ON ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

The bill (S. 1251) relating to the making of loans to veterans upon their adjusted-service certificates, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the author of the bill [Mr. BARKLEY] about it. It seems to me it is a bill which should be passed. There are veterans living in my State who desire to get loans on their certificates, but they are not allowed to under the restrictions of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when we passed the original bonus act, it did not provide, as I think it should have provided, that all the certificates should bear the same date, so that there would have been no discrimination between those who rushed in to get their certificates and those who were either modest or indifferent about it.

The results were not foreseen until we passed a year or two ago the loan act providing for the lending of 50 per cent of the value of the certificates, and the House intended, and thought they had provided, that the 2-year limitation fixed in the original law should be taken out of the bonus loan act; but it was not, and as the Director of Veterans' Affairs has interpreted the law—and I think it is according to the wording of the statute—the 2-year limitation still applies.

That operates as a penalty against those who did not rush in and get their certificates, many of whom probably never expected to apply for the bonus certificates; but, under the changed circumstances, were required to do so, or felt called on to do so, so they can not obtain loans under the law.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it not a fact that there is a reserve set up, and that money is being set aside to retire the certificates?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; under the original bonus act there is a sinking fund provided for the ultimate redemption of all the certificates.

Mr. COPELAND. I think this bill is meritorious and should be passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I sincerely hope it will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the objection withdrawn?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as will be seen by looking at the report, the bill would entail an immediate cost of \$70,000,000, in addition to the amount we have already spent and are now spending on veterans' loans. The only reason why these men can not get loans now is that they did not apply soon enough for the certificates. We might as well waive all the time limits in the act and provide that everybody who did not apply and has not applied yet may come in and get a loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the Senator think that, as a matter of fact, it is to the credit of ex-service men who did not apply, and might never have applied for their bonus certificates, except under changed circumstances? The result of the law, as it is now, is that they are penalized because they did not rush in at first and obtain the certificates provided by the original bonus act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it is greatly to the credit of those who never applied and who have not applied yet; but I know of my own knowledge that a campaign was run by many Legion posts, most Legion posts, to find applicants for these bonus certificates, that they drummed up the men and urged them to apply. Men who were loath to apply and felt that the country did not owe them anything, were urged to apply, and almost put to shame if they did not.

I shall have to insist on my objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is the first time I ever heard that statement made. I think probably it is true that some of the Legion posts, recognizing the fact that the average man does not keep in touch with all the acts of Congress, simply took steps to advise them of their rights in the matter, so that they could take advantage of the law if they saw fit to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The bill (S. 3950) to amend section 21 of the act approved June 5, 1920, entitled "An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes," as applied to the Virgin Islands of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to refer to the bill just passed over.

Is it not a fact, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky, that if a man applied a year and a half ago, in six months from now he can borrow, so that there is no great economy to the Government in postponing payment of the bonus now?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no economy in postponement. Of course, a man who had never applied for a certificate and applies to-day would be entitled, under the law, to a loan in two years. The question is whether we shall compel him to postpone his application because under the circumstances at the time he felt that perhaps he would not take advantage of the bonus law, yet has been compelled to do so under the changed circumstances.

The fact that this might ultimately cost \$70,000,000 is not at all pertinent, because the only difference is that under

the bill a veteran could get his loan now instead of having to wait two years.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

Mr. KING. Mr. President, objection was made to the consideration of the bill by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I was speaking under the rule, another bill having been taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now considering Senate bill 3950.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] has an amendment he desires to have considered in this matter, and I ask that the bill be passed over until he has an opportunity so to have it considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 3950 will be passed over.

IMMIGRATION VISAS

The bill (S. 34) to provide for review of the action of consular officers in refusing immigration visas was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who objected to the consideration of the bill, to the measure.

Mr. REED. I feel that I have to object to this. I will say in a word just why I object.

Mr. KING. If the Senator objects, that is all right. I never ask a man to give a reason.

Mr. REED. I am glad to give my reason. There is nothing concealed about it.

Mr. KING. The committee unanimously agreed upon the bill, after an amendment was made transferring the jurisdiction to the State Department.

Mr. REED. Unfortunately, I was not present, or it would not have been unanimous.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I feel that I ought to say to the Senator from Utah that I do not think this bill is practicable. I believe it would be almost impossible of operation. If we undertake to treat the right of admission of aliens as a quasi-judicial matter and give a right of appeal from consular agents to the State Department, we necessarily invite the use of political influence, and we would have every Member of Congress besieged to make an effort to get aliens into the United States.

Mr. REED. Exactly. In self-protection we ought not to pass the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there is to be any discussion, I should want to speak on the bill; but I am willing to pretermit discussion in the face of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill goes over.

PLUMBING AND GAS FITTING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3400) to amend an act of Congress approved June 18, 1898, entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia."

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Kansas to explain what this bill would do.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the main purpose of the bill is to authorize the superintendent of plumbing in the District of Columbia to revoke licenses for malpractice or fraud. At the present time he has no authority whatever along that line, and there have been numerous instances of plumbers who have at one time or another secured licenses, and have been proven to be unfit, having been found to be responsible for some bad jobs of plumbing. Yet the authorities have had no control over them. No one is opposing the bill, and it is generally desired by the authorities.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I see that the bill proposes to raise the present rate of \$3, the annual license fee for master plumbers, to not less than \$25 and not more than \$50.

Mr. CAPPER. That rate was fixed over 40 years ago, away back about 1890, I think, and it is out of line with the

license rate in all other cities, and nobody is objecting to the increase.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator say that the license fee of \$25 to \$50 is a normal fee?

Mr. CAPPER. I have investigated that thoroughly. We got information as to the license fees required in something over 50 cities. Many of them are as high as \$100, and a few are as low as \$10. This would give some latitude to the superintendent of plumbing, and we fixed it so that he could make it as low as \$25 or as high as \$50, as it seemed desirable.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is no effort to fix the rate for plumbing services in the bill?

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all. No one raised any objection to the provision in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. It seems to me that to leave the discretion between \$25 and \$50 is unwise, and certainly there ought to be an amendment, that when fixed, the fee should remain as decided on until there should be a proper regulation or an ordinance or promulgation of a different fee, because as it is provided, one plumber might be charged \$25, and another \$50. A fee of \$25 might be applied to-day and next week one of \$50. It seems to me there ought to be some uniformity, and after a fee is fixed, that it ought not to be capriciously changed, enlarged, or reduced. It ought to be fixed for a given period. I do not want to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the committee assumed that the superintendent of plumbing would be a man who would be disposed to handle the matter fairly, and who would take no advantage.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows we can not always depend upon the wisdom or the fairness of bureaucrats. I shall not object.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I can not see why we should not fix a definite fee and let it stand, either at \$25 or \$50. The officials would then have authority to grant or deny a license. To provide that it may be \$50 or \$25 means that the superintendent may grant A a license for \$25 and charge B \$50, just as his whim might influence him. That would seem to me to open the way for discrimination and unfairness. Why not fix a fee, say, at \$50?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think the bill merely gives the commissioners latitude to fix any license fee, not less than \$25 nor more than \$50. They would not fix different fees for different applicants. They would, within the range fixed, between \$25 and \$50, have the right to fix the fee.

Mr. BRATTON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RELIEF OF INDIANS IN WASHINGTON, IDAHO, AND MONTANA

The bill (S. 1523) for the relief of certain tribes or bands of Indians in the States of Washington, Idaho, and Montana, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the bill would cost the Government of the United States sixteen and a half million dollars. It is urgently requested by the Indian Commissioner that it should not be passed. It would give compensation to a lot of Indians for the violation of a treaty to which they were not parties. I object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3879) to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims," was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. I object to that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 939) to limit the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2842) to authorize construction of the Casper-Alcova division, North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I request that that may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4080) to regulate the manufacture and sale of stamped envelopes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HEBERT. I ask that that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3223) relative to the qualifications of practitioners of law in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. I ask that that may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL, SHANNON COUNTY, S. DAK.

The bill (S. 2340) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of Shannon County, S. Dak., in the construction of a consolidated high-school building to be available to both white and Indian children was announced as next in order.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, a brief explanation of this bill has been requested by several Senators.

It is really an effort at a new educational idea for the Indians. I am one of those who think that most of the money spent under the present system of educating the Indians is lost. We take them away from their relatives, away from their reservations, away from their natural environment, and send them to some far-away place and keep them in modern homes, steam-heated houses, and give them the idea that all they need is to get an education in the arts and that they can then go home and make a living. The fact of the matter is that they go home and find themselves incompetent to meet existing conditions. They find themselves out of touch with all their friends and relatives and are lost on the reservation.

This is an effort to get some cooperation in an Indian county which has a central school board. There is only one school board in the county. It is a county system. The larger part of the land is still held by the Indians, but there are at least two or three hundred white settlers there. It is the belief of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the county school board that they can get together on a central school in the county which would teach vocational training mainly instead of having imposed upon the Indians a lot of things which are not useful to them at all. The school would be attended by the whites and the Indians alike and the expense borne jointly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, the commissioner reports that he is opposed to the bill. I have had no opportunity to study the matter. I suggest that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

SENATORIAL CONTEST

The resolution (S. Res. 60) to hear and determine the contest of George M. Pritchard against Josiah W. Bailey for a seat in the Senate from the State of North Carolina was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE CASES, SOUTH CAROLINA

The bill (S. 3145) providing for the appointment of commissioners to hear cases arising under contracts of war-risk insurance in the district courts for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina was announced as next in order.

Mr. LOGAN. Over.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the objection until I can make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. LOGAN. Very well.

Mr. BRATTON. According to information furnished the Judiciary Committee, there are about 1,500 cases pending in the Federal courts of South Carolina brought by ex-service men upon their war-risk insurance contracts. There are only three Federal judges. The result is that the cases can not be tried. They are in cold storage, so to speak. The

bill authorizes the three Federal judges acting together to appoint a commissioner who shall sit at such times and places throughout the State as they may fix; that upon consent of the parties—that is to say, the veteran and the United States—the commissioner shall have jurisdiction to hear the case without a jury and render judgment subject to review by the Federal judge. It provides a salary of \$6,000 a year for the commissioner. The act expires December 31, 1934.

I know of no better other way through which that volume of business can be dispatched than the one provided.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me inquire of the Senator what are the peculiar conditions which require a provision of this kind for the State of South Carolina more than for any other State?

Mr. BRATTON. Probably the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] can explain the situation. The fact is that there are about 1,500 cases pending on the dockets of the three district courts, brought by veterans to recover upon their insurance contracts.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Why does not a like condition exist in the State of New Mexico or in my State?

Mr. BRATTON. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina, who introduced the bill, can explain the facts.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It seems to me if we get along very well in the more populous States, they ought to do very well in the State of South Carolina where, my recollection is, they have three Federal judges.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, we do have three Federal judges, but the condition down there was disclosed by a petition from the lawyers to the effect that on account of the congested condition of the courts it was impossible for them to reach these cases, so that there have accumulated 1,500 such cases. The ordinary processes of law, where these cases go before the court, entail an expense and delay that could be avoided and a great saving made to the Federal Government if such a provision as this were incorporated in the law.

The measure was introduced at the instance of the judges and of the members of the bar of my State. These cases are worthy and ought to be heard, but on account of the congestion arising from numerous causes, one of the most prolific being the prohibition question, it is impossible for them to reach these cases on the roster. This legislation was suggested on the ground that it would limit the expense and clear up the calendar so that after this congestion is over the courts might carry on without so great a loss of time and at very much less expense.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is no answer whatever to the inquiry as to why this legislation should be enacted for the State of South Carolina where the conditions are apparently no different from what they are in every other State. If we pass this special legislation for South Carolina how can we escape doing the same thing for the State of Georgia or North Carolina or Montana or any other State? If this is a condition which exists in South Carolina without any peculiar conditions and circumstances there, we ought to have a provision covering the entire United States.

Mr. SMITH. It seems to me the representative of any State in the discharge of his duties here ought to want to expedite business in his State; he ought to want to reduce Federal expenditures, and he ought to want to have a speedy disposition of worthy cases that may arise in his State. I do not know what condition exists in other States. It is the duty of those representing those States to know.

I assure my colleagues that this is an urgent condition in my State. Of course I am not aware of just the condition in other States. It may be that the conditions in other States are not parallel. The congested condition exists in my State, as I have stated, and on account of that fact I introduced the bill, went before the committee, and volumi-

nous evidence was furnished to indicate the urgent necessity for the proposed legislation for my State.

As a matter of fact, I would be very glad, as every other Senator would be, if relief could be gotten for other States. I would be glad to do what I could to bring relief to any State in a similar condition. I am not familiar with the conditions in other States, but if such conditions do exist in other States I should be only too glad to join in getting relief and saving the expense that is necessarily incurred in jury trials and regular court procedure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether any question arose during the consideration of the bill as to the power to confer what is apparently judicial authority on some one else than the courts.

Mr. BRATTON. Yes; we gave consideration to that feature of the bill. We had it briefed at some length. The conclusion was reached that where the Congress authorizes the court to appoint a commissioner it is equivalent to Congress itself creating the tribunal, and that accordingly the constitutional provision which provides that all judicial power shall be vested in the Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may create is not impinged upon. The effect of this measure is that Congress creates the tribunal in the nature of a court, although the appointment is made by a Federal judge pursuant to authority granted by Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator from New Mexico has investigated the question, I should be disposed to rely on his conclusion; but the thought occurred to me that it might be questionable whether this is not violative of the Constitution, which provides that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in the Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may create.

Mr. BRATTON. That question occurred to me and to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], with whom I served on the subcommittee. We reached the conclusion, after investigation, that Congress may authorize the appointment of a commissioner in the manner here proposed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I remember offering a measure some years ago, with considerable trepidation, providing for the appointment of commissioners merely to receive pleas in the so-called bootleg cases involving violations of the prohibition law, and another bill authorizing them to receive testimony and make recommendations to the court. The Judiciary Committee held, and I thought quite properly, that any attempt to create a court of that character—and the bill now before us goes further than the bill to which I have referred—was beyond the constitutional authority of Congress. It seems to me that this is setting up a court which is not recognized and for which there is no constitutional warrant. I shall feel constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, allow me to say that I regret that I could not have been present at the time this matter was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. I can not conceive of any reason why this should be applicable only to the State of South Carolina.

Mr. BRATTON. That is true.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I shall feel obliged to object to the consideration of the bill while we are engaged in the consideration of unobjected bills. I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] that it would probably expedite the passage of the bill, if it is entitled to passage, if it were recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, where the matter might be further considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been made, and the bill has gone over.

USE OF PISTOLS AND OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPONS

The bill (H. R. 8754) to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. Over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well.

Mr. COPELAND. I happened to be present during the hearings on this bill. As it is presented to the Senate it conforms to what is known as the model bill which has been adopted in many States in the Union. It is a form of legislation which is regarded of tremendous importance to the protection of society. I may say that sportsmen of the country, those who are interested in the legal and proper use of firearms, have given their support to the measure. I hope no member of the Senate will interfere with the passage of a bill which has to do with the protection of society. I am sure that is the sort of measure this is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada insist upon his objection?

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask that the bill be passed over. I have not had an opportunity to read it and consider it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 26) changing the name of the Committee on Pensions to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and defining its jurisdiction, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2687) to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for the cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The resolution (S. Res. 174) for an investigation of campaign expenditures of presidential, vice presidential, and senatorial candidates in 1932 was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, unless there is some agreement reached touching the resolution, it may require a long time for its consideration. I think an agreement may be reached, and suggest that it be passed over for the present.

I would like to make this additional statement. The resolution has been pending on the calendar for a prolonged period. It is desirable to secure action on it just as soon as possible. This is the resolution, I will say to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], which he and I were discussing personally a few moments ago.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arkansas if anyone interposed an objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; and the Senator well knows that I shall not object to its consideration, but I think it would be necessary to offer an amendment. I would propose to relieve the Presiding Officer of the Senate from the embarrassment of selecting the committee, so I should move to strike out the words "appointed by the Vice President" and insert in lieu thereof "elected by the Senate."

Mr. McNARY. I would suggest that the resolution be passed over to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That was the suggestion that I myself made, but the Senator seemed disposed to force the issue under the circumstances.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, no; I did not force it. I asked the Senator gently if anyone objected to it or wanted it passed over.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am ready to have it taken up now.

Mr. McNARY. I am willing to pass it over.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not asking that it go over.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

CLAIM OF OSAGE NATION OF INDIANS

The bill (S. 2352) amending the act entitled "An act authorizing the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the civilization fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States," approved February 6, 1921 (41 Stat. 1097), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 6, 1921 (41 Stat. 1097), conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the civilization fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding the provisions of Article I of the treaty of September 29, 1865 (14 Stat. 687), proclaimed January 21, 1867, and notwithstanding the lapse of time, to hear and determine the net amount realized by the United States under said treaty of 1865 from sales of Osage lands and deposited in the civilization fund in the Treasury of the United States, with interest thereon at the rate of 5 per cent per annum from the dates of deposit of money received from such sales in the Treasury of the United States, and to enter judgment for the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States for any and all such sum or sums, less any legal and equitable set-offs or counterclaims, including gratuities, arising since the date of the proclamation of said treaty on January 21, 1867, which the United States may have against the Osage Nation of Indians. The judgment of the said Court of Claims hereunder shall be subject to a special right of appeal on the full record by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States, and any such judgment, when satisfied, shall annul and cancel all claims of the said Osage Nation in and to all the matters and claims adjudicated hereunder.

"Sec. 2. That proceedings hereunder may be by an amended petition in the Court of Claims, to be filed within one year of the passage of this act, making the Osage Nation of Indians party plaintiff and the United States of America party defendant, to be verified by the authorized attorney or attorneys of the said Osage Nation employed under contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, May 5, 1931, as provided by law, on information and belief as to the facts, and no other statement or verification shall be necessary; or said action hereunder may be by motion to be filed for and on behalf of the Osage Nation of Indians within one year of the passage of this act, to reopen and reconsider the case filed in said Court of Claims under the said act of Congress of February 6, 1921, supra, entitled 'Osage Nation of Indians against the United States of America,' and known as No. B-38: *Provided*, That the evidence heretofore submitted to the said Court of Claims in the said cause shall be admitted for all purposes in the action hereby authorized, and additional evidence, including official letters, papers, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be offered in such proceedings.

"Sec. 3. That upon the final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall decree such fees and expenses as may be reasonable to be paid the attorneys employed by the Osage Nation of Indians under contracts approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and in no event shall such fees and expenses exceed the amount stipulated in such contracts, nor amount to more than 10 per cent of the judgment recorded in the said cause."

CHARLES LAMKIN

The bill (H. R. 2704) for the relief of Charles Lamkin was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

J. P. MOYNIHAN

The bill (H. R. 3691) for the relief of J. P. Moynihan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. P. Moynihan, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of \$1,000. Such sum represents the amount of a bail bond deposited with the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois to secure the appearance of Joseph Krawchuk and which was forfeited.

CARROLL K. MORAN

The bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of Carroll K. Moran was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Carroll K. Moran,

deputy clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond, Va., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$182.70. Such sum represents the amount paid as witness fees and mileage by Carroll K. Moran to witnesses attending the October, 1929, term of court of the eastern district of Virginia, for which he was not reimbursed by the United States.

PASQUALE MIRABELLI

The bill (H. R. 4453) for the relief of Pasquale Mirabelli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Pasquale Mirabelli, of Rochester, N. Y., the sum of \$1,000, representing the amount of cash bond which he deposited in behalf of his son, Vincenzo Mirabelli, against whom deportation proceedings had been instituted, and which bond was declared forfeited prior to the time the alien was apprehended and deported: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

PALO VERDE VALLEY, CALIF.

The bill (S. 4443) for emergency relief of Palo Verde Valley, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of that bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the Palo Verde Valley is a tributary really to the Colorado River. The Colorado River has caused it vast difficulties in the past. The people of Palo Verde Valley, unfortunately, are absolutely broke. Their farms have been sold for delinquent taxes. This bill has passed the other House, and the report of the House committee on the bill, Senators will find, accurately describes the situation. It is an emergent measure. It must be passed very quickly or it will be of no consequence at all. The Colorado is coming down now, and within the next couple of weeks something must be done. This is the endeavor of the department to afford some relief.

The difficulty arises not from the fault of the people of the Palo Verde Valley but from construction work of the United States at Yuma Dam. They have expended in that valley some \$2,000,000 and are at the end of their resources. Now they ask that \$70,000 be transferred to the reclamation fund, that an authorization be made therefor, and that aid be extended them. It is one of the most appealing cases of which I know. It is an emergent case.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. May I inquire of the Senator from California if the injury is due to the Yuma Dam why is it not a proper charge against the Yuma project?

Mr. JOHNSON. I doubt very much if it is a proper charge against the Yuma project. It is due, undoubtedly, in part to the construction of the Yuma Dam, and that being a United States construction work, and that is one of the reasons I give for asking that aid be extended by the United States Government. Would the Senator from Montana do me the kindness to read the report of the House committee in respect to the matter? It is very brief and it shows conclusively the situation there existing. I quote from it as follows:

The levees must be repaired, raised, and strengthened. No work has been done upon them for several years past, but fortunately those have been years of low flow in the river. This year records an unusually heavy snowfall in the headwaters of the Rocky Mountains.

I can confirm that, and I can confirm as well that the community is now very close to disaster. The report continues:

Earliest possible action is necessary if this community of 3,000 people is to be saved. The Palo Verde irrigation district, which

represents the farmers, is bankrupt, its treasury is empty, its credit is gone, and it has defaulted upon its bonds. The people themselves are without means to do this necessary work. They, too, are without credit. Over 30,000 acres went delinquent and were sold for taxes last year.

I know the conditions that exist there and the necessity for relief. I do trust that the bill may be passed, because if delay shall be occasioned disaster, I think, is certain to ensue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$70,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to protect the Palo Verde Valley, Calif., from overflow and destruction by the Colorado River floods, to be transferred to the reclamation fund and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of repairing and reconstructing the levee system on the Colorado River in front of the said Palo Verde Valley, to be immediately available.

REGULATION OF COMMON CARRIERS BY WATER THROUGH PANAMA CANAL

The bill (S. 4491) amending the shipping act, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating common carriers by water in interstate commerce of the United States engaged in transportation by way of the Panama Canal, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator from California think in view of the importance of this measure that it should be taken up to-day?

Mr. JOHNSON. Unless the Senator from New York is anxious to have the bill taken up, I think it so very important that it might go over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, this bill was thoroughly considered by the Committee on Commerce, and, after protracted hearings, was reshaped and as reported the objectionable features which had been found have been eliminated.

I think it is a very necessary bill, and that is the feeling of the shipping interests and also of the shippers on the Pacific coast. I hope the Senator will not interpose any objection.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] has any objection to this bill?

Mr. COPELAND. I can not say as to that, as he is not a member of the committee. I do not see, however, how he could possibly have any objection. It is designed simply to fill in the gap which has been found in the shipping act; it has to do with the establishment of uniform rates so that no shipper will be imposed upon by secret rebates. It follows the usual policy of our country as regards the avoidance of rebates by transportation companies, and I hope the Senator from Utah will permit the bill to pass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it seems to me the passage of the bill will result in the creation of a monopoly and prevent legitimate and proper competition.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the very purpose of the bill is to avoid such a condition, I may say to my friend, and I am sure if he will study it he will realize that it has been worked out very carefully and that he can find no fault with it.

Mr. KING. I ask for an explanation as to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. COPELAND. The purpose of the bill is well outlined, I am sure, in the report which the Senator will find accompanying the bill. It is intended, as I have said, to prevent secret rebates and to provide for the filing of actual rates to be charged to all shippers in place of the fictitious rates which are now established. The shipping line is required to file with the board what it purposes to charge in the way of rates on commodities transported from the coast. Those rate schedules are looked over by the board and publicly

promulgated in order that every shipper may know exactly what the rate is on oranges or apples, or whatever the commodity may be. There has been a cutthroat operation of shipping on the coast which it has been sought to overcome by various steamship conferences, but under this bill the board in Washington is given authority to receive the schedules of rates, to file them, and to give publicity to them so that every shipper may know that he is exactly on the same plane with every other shipper.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. KING. Suppose that some person in Boston desired to ship a few carloads of fish or any other commodity to New York or to Philadelphia, would he come within the provisions of this bill?

Mr. COPELAND. No. It refers merely to intercoastal traffic.

Mr. KING. To purely intercoastal traffic?

Mr. COPELAND. To purely intercoastal traffic; it has nothing to do with the coastwise trade.

Mr. KING. Nor with shipping on the Great Lakes?

Mr. COPELAND. Nor with shipping on the Great Lakes, but simply shipping through the Panama Canal.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act—

The term "common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce" for the purposes of this act means a common carrier by water engaged mainly in the transportation for hire of passengers or property between one State of the United States and any other State of the United States by way of the Panama Canal.

Sec. 2. That every common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce shall file with the United States Shipping Board and keep open to public inspection schedules showing all the rates, fares, and charges for or in connection with transportation between points on its own route; and, if a through route has been established, all the rates, fares, and charges for or in connection with transportation between points on its own route and points on the route of any other carrier by water. The schedules filed and kept open to public inspection as aforesaid by any such carrier shall plainly show the places between which passengers and/or freight will be carried, and shall contain the classification of freight and of passenger accommodations in force, and shall also state separately each terminal or other charge, privilege, or facility, granted or allowed, and any rules or regulations which in anywise change, affect, or determine any part or the aggregate of such aforesaid rates, fares, or charges, or the value of the service rendered to the passenger, consignor, or consignee. Such carriers in establishing and fixing rates, fares, or charges may make equal rates, fares, or charges for similar service between all ports of origin and all ports of destination. Such schedules shall be plainly printed, and copies shall be kept posted in a public and conspicuous place at every wharf, dock, and office of such carrier where passengers or freight are received for transportation, in such manner that they shall be readily accessible to the public and can be conveniently inspected.

No change shall be made in the rates, fares, or charges, or classifications, rules, or regulations, which have been filed and posted as required by this section, except by the publication, filing, and posting as aforesaid of a new schedule or schedules which shall become effective not earlier than 30 days after date of posting and filing thereof with the board, and such schedule or schedules shall plainly show the changes proposed to be made in the schedule or schedules then in force and the time when the rates, fares, charges, classifications, rules, or regulations as changed are to become effective: *Provided*, That the board may, in its discretion and for good cause, allow changes upon less than the period of 30 days herein specified: *And provided further*, That schedules or changes which provide for extension of actual service to additional ports at rates of said carrier already in effect for similar service at the nearest port of call to said additional ports shall become effective immediately upon notice to the board.

From and after 90 days following enactment hereof no person shall engage in transportation as a common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce unless and until its schedules as provided by this section have been duly and properly filed and posted; nor shall any common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for the transportation of passengers or property or for any service in connection therewith than the rates, fares, and/or charges which are specified in its schedules filed with the board and duly posted and in effect at the time; nor shall any such carrier refund or remit in any manner or by any device any

portion of the rates, fares, or charges so specified, nor extend or deny to any person any privilege or facility except in accordance with such schedules.

The board shall by regulations prescribe the form and manner in which the schedules required by this section shall be published, filed, and posted; and the board is authorized to reject any schedule filed with it which is not in consonance with this section and with such regulations. Any schedule so rejected by the board shall be void and its use shall be unlawful.

Any violation of any provision of this section by a common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$5,000 for each act of violation and/or for each day such violation continues, to be recovered by the United States in a civil action.

Sec. 3. Whenever there shall be filed with the board any schedule stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge, or any new individual or joint classification, or any new individual or joint regulation or practice affecting any rate, fare, or charge, the board shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, and if it so orders without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice: *Provided, however*, That there shall be no suspension of a tariff schedule or service which extends to additional ports, actual service at rates of said carrier for similar service already in effect at the nearest port of call to said additional port.

Pending such hearing and the decision thereon the board, upon filing with such schedule and delivering to the carrier or carriers affected thereby a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may from time to time suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than seven months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after full hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the board may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective. If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed change of rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period. The board shall give preference to the hearing and decision of such questions and decide the same as speedily as possible.

Sec. 4. That upon sworn petition by any common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce alleging the charging of any unduly low rate, fare, or charge for comparable water service, or unduly low rates, fares, or charges for comparable water service, by any other such carrier with which the petitioner is in competition, the board may investigate and after hearing determine and by order prescribe the minimum rate, fare, or charge for comparable water service, or the minimum rates, fares, or charges for comparable water service, same to be observed by such carriers. Upon its own motion and with the same powers the board may investigate any competitive situation between common carriers by water in intercoastal commerce, in which, from information before it, there appears to be involved the charging of unduly low rates, fares, or charges for comparable water service: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to a tariff, schedule, or service which extends to additional ports actual service at rates of said carrier for similar service already in effect at the nearest port of call to said additional port.

Any common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce which fails or neglects to obey any order of the board made under authority of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$5,000 for each act of failure or neglect, such fine to be recovered by the United States in a civil action.

Sec. 5. That the provisions of the shipping act, 1916, and as amended prior to this act, shall in all respects, except as amended by this act, continue to be applicable to common carriers by water in intercoastal commerce.

Sec. 6. That this act may be cited as the intercoastal shipping act, 1932.

CHARLES C. BENNETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1673) for the relief of Charles C. Bennett, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of" to strike out "\$7,174.60" and insert "\$5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government"; and on page 2, line 3, after the name "North Carolina," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles C. Bennett, of the city of Candor, N. C., the sum of \$5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government for bodily injuries sustained by him on December 16, 1927, when an automobile in which he was riding was in collision with a reconnaissance truck of the United States Army, the said truck being one of a fleet of trucks traveling toward Fort Bragg, N. C., driven by Pvt. Thomas C. Robertson, of Fort Bragg, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS

The bill (S. 4495) amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916 (ch. 9, par. 1, 39 Stat. 862), and as amended February 28, 1931 (ch. 328, 46 Stat. 1454), was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I should be glad if the Senator from Wyoming would explain the purpose of this bill.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. President, we have in Wyoming a number of oil fields where the production of oil is now very small. This bill would permit people to file stock-raising homesteads within these fields.

Mr. BRATTON. Is the bill limited to Wyoming?

Mr. CAREY. No; it is not limited to Wyoming.

Mr. BRATTON. Is it a general bill?

Mr. CAREY. It is a general bill. I may say that it has the approval of the Interior Department and that it protects the Government in that the Secretary of the Interior will have to approve of any applications for homestead entries before they could be granted and also the permittee or the lessee would have to give his approval before filing could be approved.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill. I should like to examine it before we pass it. So I ask that it go over for to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BRATTON subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I objected to the consideration of Order of Business 653, Senate bill 4495, introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. Since then he has explained the measure to my entire satisfaction. I withdraw the objection and ask that we may revert to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to returning to the bill?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not object to the bill if it applies only to the State of Wyoming, but I am not so sure that I would wish the bill to apply to the State in which I reside.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator why he objects?

Mr. KING. I might or might not object. I am not sure whether it would be desirable to the people of my State.

Mr. CAREY. The bill permits filing upon lands which are not now subject to entry. The State and the Government are amply protected. All these applications have to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The bill exempts naval oil reserves and also protects the permittee who may have a mineral lease on the land in providing that his consent must be obtained before the homestead application is approved by the Secretary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Do the mineral rights pass to the homesteader under the bill?

Mr. CAREY. The mineral rights are retained by the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. That is one objection I would have to the principle involved. I think, of course, where a man obtains title to land the minerals ought to go with it; but I shall not object. If, upon examination, I find that the bill ought not to be applicable to my State, or that the people do not desire it, I shall move to reconsider merely for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. CAREY. I think the Senator's people will approve of the provisions of this bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916 (ch. 9, par. 1, 39 Stat. 862), and as amended February 28, 1931 (ch. 328, 46 Stat. 1454), be amended to read as follows:

"From and after December 29, 1916, it shall be lawful for any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a stock-raising homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of unappropriated unreserved public lands in reasonable compact form: *Provided, however*, That the land so entered shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as 'stock-raising lands': *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section lands withdrawn or reserved solely as valuable for oil or gas shall not be deemed to be appropriated or reserved: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to naval petroleum reserves and naval oil-shale reserves: *And provided further*, That should said lands be within the limits of the geological structure of a producing oil or gas field entry can only be allowed, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, in the absence of objection after due notice by the lessee or permittee, and any patent therefor shall contain a reservation to the United States of all minerals in said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same."

ALBERT GONZALES

The bill (S. 1594) for the relief of Albert Gonzales was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to have the bill explained.

Mr. COOLIDGE. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk may read the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill as reported by the Committee on Claims with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Gonzales the sum of \$75 per month, in full settlement of all claims against the Government on account of injuries suffered by him on July 28, 1929, while a student at the citizens' military training camp at Fort Bliss, Tex., said monthly payments to be paid through the United States Employees' Compensation Commission: *Provided*, That if, and when, Congress enacts general legislation providing compensation or damages to persons injured while attending citizens' training camps that the said Albert Gonzales, in lieu of compensation herein provided, will hereafter take only said benefits as shall have been provided in said act for similar cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think there is a misapprehension upon the part of the Senator from New Mexico. I made no objection. I simply made an inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not regard this legislation as setting up a precedent that will commit the Government of the United States hereafter in all of the citizens' training camps and all organizations of the Guards to be liable for any misadventure, any accident that may occur?

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Utah that this young man is totally blind. He has been so for almost three years. He is a young man, about 20 or 22 years old. He will spend the rest of his lifetime totally blind as the result of an injury suffered while attending a military training camp at Fort Bliss. The Secretary of War has recommended passage of the bill in the amended form.

It seems to me that we may well resolve every doubt in favor of this young man who lost his eyesight and must go through life blind.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Was the injury received while the soldier was in the line of duty?

Mr. BRATTON. He was attending the training camp. They were enjoying recreation at a swimming pool at Fort Bliss. It was a part of the activities at Fort Bliss. Just how the accident occurred or what the producing or contributing cause was may be somewhat doubtful; but the indisputable fact is that he suffered the accident while there, lost his eyesight as a result of it, and is totally blind. I appeal to the Senator to resolve every doubt in favor of this claimant, and let the boy have what little this bill accords him.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the reason why my attention was challenged to the case is because in my own State only a few months ago, perhaps a year ago, a young man was killed while serving in the same capacity as this young man, and the father wrote me about the matter. The father was largely dependent upon the young man for support. I made inquiry of all the departments, and was advised that the Government was under no obligation, and that if the Government assumed the responsibility for all of the accidents and injuries that occur in the training camps, and so forth, it would be highly improper. So I communicated with the father, and told him that there was no liability whatever upon the part of the Government, and there was no compensation due him.

Mr. BRATTON. Probably there is no technical liability; but, in my judgment, a young man totally blind resulting from the accident I have outlined is entitled to, and I know he will have, the sympathy of the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABANDONED INDIAN-SCHOOL SITE, ZEBIA, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 208) to authorize transfer of the abandoned Indian-school site and building at Zeba, Mich., to the L'Anse Band of Lake Superior Indians, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey by deed, without cost, to the L'Anse Band of Lake Superior Indians, for community meetings and other like purposes, the abandoned Indian-school site and improvements thereon located at Zeba, Mich., embracing approximately three-fourths of an acre of land within the east half of southeast quarter of southwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 19, township 51 north, range 32 west, Michigan meridian: *Provided,* That said conveyance shall be made to three members of the band duly elected by said Indians as trustees for the band and their successors in office.

JOHN E. CLICK

The bill (S. 4372) for the relief of John E. Click was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John E. Click, chief clerk of the administrative office of the Alaska division, Bureau of Indian Affairs, with headquarters now at Juneau, Alaska, is hereby relieved of reimbursing the United States for credit to the appropriation "Education of Natives of Alaska, 1930-31" the sum of \$261.82 paid to the Alaska Steamship Co., of Seattle, Wash., from said appropriation for transporting his personal and household goods from Seattle, Wash., to Juneau, Alaska, upon permanent change of station, under an authorization issued by the Department of the Interior.

SHERBURNE MERCANTILE CO.

The bill (H. R. 4143) for the relief of the Sherburne Mercantile Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, why is the Government to pay this mercantile company?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, this bill covers supplies furnished by the Sherburne Mercantile Co. to the Indians at the request of the Government. I held up the claim before the Indian Affairs Committee for a while, and had it investigated; but the department recommends it and

states that they ordered the supplies from the mercantile company at different times, and that the Government is liable.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Who acted for the Government?

Mr. WHEELER. The Indian agent out there.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Was he authorized by the department?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes. He is the Indian agent in charge.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He is not authorized to contract for supplies, is he?

Mr. WHEELER. These were all small supplies, ordered over quite a period of time, things that were necessary to be had for the Indians.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has investigated the claim?

Mr. WHEELER. Very carefully, indeed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, why should not this be a charge against the Indian Bureau? That is, why should it not be paid from the appropriation made to the Indian Bureau?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, we do not pay claims out of the appropriation for the bureau. We pay them out of the General Treasury. We can not appropriate, for the payment of a claim of this kind, money that is already appropriated for running the department. We must appropriate it out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. KING. The point I am making is that it ought to have been included in the Indian appropriation bill, for this reason: We are trying to determine just what the Indian Bureau is receiving from the Government and what it has collected from the Indians. If we pay claims upon the side the Indian Bureau will not be charged with this, and the expenses of the bureau will be apparently that much less than they really are.

Mr. WHEELER. It is possibly true that it should have been included in the Indian appropriation bill, but it would not make a particle of difference. I mean the claim is a just claim of the Sherburne Mercantile Co. for supplies ordered—as I recall the evidence before the committee—emergency supplies ordered for the Indians during the winter season. The company furnished them and they never were paid for them. They put in a claim and it was checked up carefully, both by the department and by the Committees on Indian Affairs both of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator if he has investigated to determine whether this will be a reimbursable charge or a charge upon the funds of the Indians?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think it is reimbursable at all against the Indians. As a matter of fact these Blackfeet Indians have very little money, if any at all. We are constantly appropriating money for them out of the general fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$725.80 to the Sherburne Mercantile Co., of Browning, Mont., in full settlement of their claim against the Government for supplies furnished Indians under the jurisdiction of the Blackfeet Agency during the fiscal year 1918 and 1919.

CROW INDIAN TRIBAL COUNCIL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8031) to provide for expenses of the Crow Indian Tribal Council and authorized delegates of the tribe, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to expend \$5,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds standing to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians in the Treasury of the United States for expenses of the Fort Peck Indian Tribal Council and authorized delegates of the tribe.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to expend \$5,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds standing to the credit of the Crow Indians in the Treasury of the United States for expenses of the Crow Indian Tribal Council and authorized delegates of the tribe.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to expend \$5,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds standing to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians in the Treasury of the United States for expenses of the Fort Peck Indian Tribal Council and authorized delegates of the tribe.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Montana, who is a member of the Indian Affairs Committee, whether \$5,000 for the expenses of the delegates is not an unusually large sum?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that this is a general appropriation. It does not cover one specific trip down here, but is to cover several years, so that when the delegates do come down here they will have the necessary amount to enable them to come. They will not spend it in one year, or possibly two years; but it is appropriated so that they will have it available in case of necessity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for expenses of the Crow and Fort Peck Indian Tribal Councils and authorized delegates of such tribes."

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF DISTRICT TAXICABS OWNERS

The bill (S. 99) to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I should like to have the author of the bill, or the Senator reporting it, state what liability is imposed on taxicab owners in the District of Columbia by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, there is no liability fixed. It is left to the commissioners to try to protect the people of the District of Columbia. A great many accidents have been caused in the District by taxicabs running around. This year there were 1,750 accidents; and at the present time there is no financial responsibility for anybody in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The bill requires the operators of taxicabs to file bonds?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In what amount? Is that left with the commissioners?

Mr. KEAN. That is to be decided by the District Commissioners, who are responsible. We can not very well decide here what bonds they ought to file. That is up to the Commissioners of the District.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What security is required now—any?

Mr. KEAN. None.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, to strike out lines 9 and 10, and on page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 11, inclusive, in the following words:

PAR. 2a. That the commission is hereby authorized and empowered to require any and all corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, operating, controlling, or managing any motor cabs or other vehicles for the conveyance of persons within the District of Columbia for hire, except such common carriers as have been expressly exempted from the jurisdiction of the commission, to satisfy the commission of their ability to discharge any claims

for damages adjudged against them by filing with the commission a bond, policy, or policies of insurance of such amount or amounts as may be required by the commission.

And to insert:

PAR. 2a. That the commission is hereby directed to require any and all corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, operating, controlling, managing, or renting any motor cabs or other vehicles for the conveyance of persons within the District of Columbia for hire, except street cars, busses operating over a given route on a fixed schedule, and such common carriers as have been expressly exempted from the jurisdiction of the commission, to file with the commission a bond or bonds, policy or policies of insurance in such amount or amounts as may be required from time to time by the commission, conditioned for the payment to any person of any judgment recovered against such corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, or renters of their cabs for death or for injury to persons and/or property caused in the operation, maintenance, use, or the defective construction of such motor cabs or other vehicles. Said bond or bonds to be made out to the District of Columbia as obligee, for the use or benefit of any person obtaining such a judgment, and such bond or policy of insurance shall contain a provision for a continuing liability thereunder, notwithstanding any recovery thereon. A surety upon a bond filed pursuant to this paragraph, or an insurance company whose policy has been so filed, may file a notice with the Public Utilities Commission that upon the expiration of 20 days from such filing such surety will cease to be liable upon such bond, or, in the case of such insurance company, that upon the expiration of such time such policy will be canceled. Any such corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, failing to comply with this paragraph, or whose bond or insurance policy has been canceled, shall forfeit his, their, or its right to operate as a carrier of passengers for hire or to rent cabs for use as common-carrier vehicles within the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That paragraph 85 of the said act be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Each such violation, failure, or refusal shall be deemed a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$300 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 974), be amended by adding a new paragraph, numbered 2a, to read as follows:

"PAR. 2a. That the commission is hereby directed to require any and all corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, operating, controlling, managing, or renting any motor cabs or other vehicles for the conveyance of persons within the District of Columbia for hire, except street cars, busses operating over a given route on a fixed schedule, and such common carriers as have been expressly exempted from the jurisdiction of the commission, to file with the commission a bond or bonds, policy or policies of insurance in such amount or amounts as may be required from time to time by the commission, conditioned for the payment to any person of any judgment recovered against such corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, or renters of their cabs, for death or for injury to persons and/or property caused in the operation, maintenance, use, or the defective construction of such motor cabs or other vehicles. Said bond or bonds, to be made out to the District of Columbia as obligee, for the use or benefit of any person obtaining such a judgment, and such bond or policy of insurance shall contain a provision for a continuing liability thereunder, notwithstanding any recovery thereon. A surety upon a bond filed pursuant to this paragraph, or an insurance company whose policy has been so filed, may file a notice with the Public Utilities Commission that upon the expiration of 20 days from such filing such surety will cease to be liable upon such bond, or in the case of such insurance company, that upon the expiration of such time such policy will be canceled. Any such corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, failing to comply with this paragraph, or whose bond or insurance policy has been canceled, shall forfeit his, their, or its right to operate as a carrier of passengers for hire, or to rent cabs for use as common-carrier vehicles within the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. That paragraph 85 of the said act be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Each such violation, failure, or refusal shall be deemed a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$300 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma objects, and the bill will be passed over.

ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the order under which we are proceeding with the calendar be suspended at 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At 2 o'clock.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 738, House Joint Resolution 341.

Let me remark that this is a joint resolution which is intended to exempt the locators of mining claims from the necessity of doing assessment work for the year ending June 30, 1932; and unless action is taken upon the matter immediately it will be of no avail whatever.

Mr. REED. What is the number of the joint resolution?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. House Joint Resolution 341.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the joint resolution be read.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, H. J. Res. 341, providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than \$100 worth of labor to be performed, or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, including Alaska, during the fiscal year from July 1, 1931, to July 1, 1932.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, under the law \$100 worth of work must be done on each claim each year. The year ends on June 30. By reason of the distressed condition many locators have found it impossible to do the work this year. If the legislation is not passed, they must do the work within the current month.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I received a letter just this morning, which I regret I did not bring into the Chamber with me, showing the urgent necessity of the passage of this measure. I trust it will be passed before the 1st of July.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was considered by the Senate, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 4291) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHEELER. Let that go over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of an absent Senator, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3938) to provide for the transportation of certain juvenile offenders to States under the law of which they have committed offenses or are delinquent, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES

The bill (S. 4020) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of practice and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases after verdict was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what change does this bill make in existing law?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the request of the Department of Justice. It provides that the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of practice and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings after verdict in criminal cases. The object of the bill is to speed up the trial of appeals in criminal cases in the district courts. It has been

carefully considered by the Judiciary Committee, and is unanimously recommended to the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of practice and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings after verdict in criminal cases in district courts of the United States, including the District Courts of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, and Virgin Islands, in the Supreme Courts of the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in the United States Court for China, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. The right of appeal shall continue in those cases in which appeals are now authorized by law, but the rules made as herein authorized may prescribe the times for and manner of taking appeals and of preparing records and bills of exceptions and the conditions on which supersedeas or bail may be allowed.

Sec. 3. The Supreme Court may fix the dates when such rules shall take effect and the extent to which they shall apply to proceedings then pending, and after they become effective all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what happened to Senate bill 4291?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill went over on objection.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ARCHITECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3786) to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the international congress of architects to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1933, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to invite foreign governments to participate in the International Congress of Architects to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1933.

Sec. 2. The sum of \$10,000 is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as a contribution by the United States for the expenses and entertainment, while in the United States, of the delegates from foreign nations participating in this congress. Such sum shall be expended by the Secretary of the American section of the permanent committee of such congress under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe. The United States shall not be liable, directly, or indirectly, for any expense, obligation, or indebtedness incident to such congress.

Sec. 3. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the International Congress of Architects upon which there may be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe on the conditions that said articles are exported within six months after their arrival.

YVONNE HALE

The bill (S. 4379) for the relief of Yvonne Hale, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Yvonne Hale, widow of Bernard F. Hale, late American Consul at Venice, Italy, the sum of \$4,000, equal to one year's salary of her deceased husband.

RAPID CITY INDIAN SCHOOL LAND

The bill (H. R. 9254) to authorize the exchange of a part of the Rapid City Indian School land for a part of the Pennington County Poor Farm, South Dakota, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 931) to amend a part of section 1 of the act of May 27, 1908, chapter 200, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 592), was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INVALIDATION OF INDICTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 933) to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. How would that change existing law? It seems to be a measure of some importance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have just been reading the report. Apparently the only change is that it provides that an indictment shall not be invalidated if there were present in the grand-jury room a clerk or stenographer to assist the district attorney. That is the only change.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is correct, Mr. President. The matter had very careful consideration on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 1025. No indictment found and presented by a grand jury in any district or other court of the United States shall be deemed insufficient, nor shall the trial, judgment, or other proceeding thereon be affected by reason of any defect or imperfection in matter of form only, which shall not tend to the prejudice of the defendant, or by reason of the attendance before the grand jury during the taking of testimony of one or more clerks or stenographers employed in a clerical capacity to assist the district attorney or other counsel for the Government who shall, in that connection, be deemed to be persons acting for and on behalf of the United States in an official capacity and function."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 940) to provide against misuse of official badges and other insignia designed for the use of public officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WIENER BANK VEREIN

The bill (S. 3375) for the relief of Wiener Bank Verein was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let us have an explanation of that bill. It carries a pretty liberal appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

MOTHER'S DAY

The resolution (S. Res. 186) favoring an expression on Mother's Day of our love and reverence for motherhood was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to inquire what is the occasion for passing a resolution calling for an expression on Mother's Day? I think we ought to assume that the American people have enough love and respect and reverence for mothers without a resolution being adopted. I would like to have an explanation.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 436) to amend the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented, in respect to the definition of intoxicating liquor was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2473) to provide for increasing the permissible alcoholic content of beer, ale, or porter to 3½ per cent by weight, and to provide means by which all such beer, ale, or porter shall be made of products of American farms was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS OF SEMINOLE INDIANS

The bill (S. 4340) authorizing the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear and determine certain claims of the Seminole Nation or Tribe of Indians, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection so that I may make a statement?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I withhold the objection. I notice there is an adverse report on the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I will state the facts in this case. The Seminole Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma had at one time a very large tract of land that was allotted to them, save two small parcels reserved for school purposes. One was the Emahaka tract and the other was the Mekasukay tract.

Oil was discovered in that section of the country, and immediately the oil companies desired to get possession of those two school tracts. The Government, acting through the Indian Bureau, desired to lease the lands for oil purposes. The Seminole Tribe did not desire to have the land leased; they desired to keep the tracts for school purposes. At that time there were schools on both tracts.

Under the law and under the treaty the Seminole Tribe had the right to dispose of the lands as they saw proper, of course under the supervision of the Government. The Government had to be consulted, and approve transfers or conveyances.

When the Indian Bureau could not lease the lands because the Indians would not sign the conveyances, on two or three different occasions the Government appointed a special chief for the particular purpose of executing a lease. The chiefs would not serve, they would not execute the leases, so later on, the department desiring to lease the lands, and not being able to get a chief appointed who would serve and sign the leases, the Government took it upon itself to approve the leases. The leases were therefore approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and the oil companies went upon the lands and discovered oil.

Because of these lands being leased, and because oil was discovered, the schools have been closed. They are surrounded by oil wells and, of course, the pumping and the noise of drilling after oil was discovered and wells were opened made it practically impossible to continue the schools there. So the policy of the bureau, over the protest of the Indians, has resulted in the forced leasing of their lands and the closing of the schools.

The Indians have not accepted the money, and they will not accept the money, which has been tendered to them. They desire, of course, to go into court and present their claim to the court, to have the clouds upon these two tracts of land removed.

This bill would simply give them the right to go into the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma and to present their equitable claim based upon treaty rights with the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. I will take it up with the department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 4095) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," by extending its provisions to provide for the punishment of stealing from passenger or Pullman cars, or from passengers on such cars, while such cars are parts of interstate trains, and authorizing prosecution therefor in any district in which the defendant may have taken or been in possession of the stolen articles, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) opposing reductions in appropriations for the Postal and Customs Services that would

seriously disrupt such services, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SINGING OF AMERICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the first public singing of America, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this one hundredth anniversary of the first public singing of America be commended to all citizens for appropriate recognition in connection with the celebration of Independence Day on the 4th day of July, 1932.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the 4th day of July, 1932, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the first public singing in Park Street Church, Boston, Mass., by a chorus of children, of the great and thrilling patriotic hymn America, written by the Rev. Samuel Francis Smith; and

Whereas this significant event already is promised splendid recognition at Detroit, Mich., where the contributions of patriotic school children have provided a beautiful monument to the hymn and to its author, which will be appropriately dedicated upon Independence Day; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that there should be general observance of this anniversary because of the incalculable inspiration which has touched the life of the Nation through the countless millions of voices, in peace and in war, which have sung "My country 'tis of thee" across the century.

MARY E. STEBBINS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 361) for the relief of Mary E. Stebbins, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "\$5,000 as compensation" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$50 per month, in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government," so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary E. Stebbins, the sum of \$50 per month, in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries sustained by falling over a bag of mail in the entrance of the post office at Ava, Ill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PIPE LINES

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 741, House bill 7305, to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I know something about this bill and that it would provide for about a half a million dollars' worth of work to be done immediately, most of which is going to be performed by common labor. It will be of immediate assistance in the work of finding employment for people now out of work here in the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to grant permission to the Gulf Refining Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas and registered and doing business in the District of Columbia, to lay down, construct, maintain, and use not more than 10 pipe lines for the carriage of petroleum and petroleum products from a point or points within square 662 in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, said square being bounded on the north by E Street, on the south by S Street, on the east by Water Street and South Capitol Street, and on the west by Half Street (west), in and through Water Street, South Capitol Street, in an easterly direction to lot 4 of square south of square 708, which lot is bounded on the north by lands of the Standard Oil Co., on the south by S Street, extended, on the east by Anacostia River, and on the west by South Capitol Street.

Sec. 2. All the construction and use provided for herein shall be in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and under such regulations and rentals as the said commissioners may make and establish in connection herewith.

Sec. 3. No permission granted or enjoyed hereunder shall vest any title or interest in or to the land within the above-mentioned streets, or affect any right, title, or interest of the United States in or to land within square south of square 708.

Sec. 4. The Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time.

RAPID CITY INDIAN SCHOOL LAND

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, objection was made by the Senator from Montana to the consideration of House bill 9254, to authorize the exchange of a part of the Rapid City Indian School land for a part of the Pennington County Poor Farm, South Dakota.

The Interior Department has looked into this matter, the Secretary reports favorably on this bill, and states that the Government would get several times the advantage in the exchange. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up again. The Senator from Montana has no objection to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the bill be reported.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to exchange, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, an irregular tract of 84.4 acres, more or less, of the Rapid City Indian School land, located in the northwest quarter section 3, township 1 north, range 7 east of the Black Hills meridian, South Dakota, for 38.09 acres, more or less, of the Pennington County Poor Farm, in the adjoining north half of the southwest quarter of the same section, including all improvements thereon; transfer of title to the Indian School reserve land to be accomplished by deed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator states that the Government would get the advantage of the trade. Is the Indian the man who will get the disadvantage?

Mr. NORBECK. Of course the Government represents the Indian in the matter. It is a Government school for the benefit of the Indians.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are some bridge bills on the calendar which can not be reached in the ordinary course before 2 o'clock, and they are matters of such urgency that I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 765 and Calendar 766.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4635) authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Owensboro, and permitting the Commonwealth of Kentucky to act jointly with the State of Indiana in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and more adequately provide for military and other purposes the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, be, and it hereby is, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Owensboro, Ky., and the approaches thereto, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, and/or operation of such bridge and the approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same

as in condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky or the successors of said commission, hereby is authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. If tolls are charged for the use of the bridge, the rates of toll to be charged shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund not to exceed an amount sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and not to exceed an amount, in addition to the foregoing, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the aggregate cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interests and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not exceeding 25 years from the date of approval of this act. In any event, tolls shall be charged on the basis aforesaid for transit over the bridge if revenue bonds of the Commonwealth of Kentucky are issued to provide money to pay all or any part of the cost thereof, and such tolls shall be continued and adjusted at such rates as may be necessary to pay such bonds with interest thereon and any lawful premium for the retirement thereof before maturity, subject only to the power of the Secretary of War or other authorized Federal authority to regulate such rates.

After a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and approaches shall have been provided to the extent hereinabove required, the bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. Tolls shall be uniform as between individuals and as between vehicles of the same class using the bridge.

Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring tolls to be charged for the use of such bridge, except as hereinabove provided, and nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the Commonwealth of Kentucky, acting by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or its successors, from paying all or any part of the cost of such bridge and its approaches from the State road fund, or from paying all or any part of the cost of maintenance, repair, or operation of such bridge from the State road fund of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Sec. 6. At any time before or after the completion of such bridge the Commonwealth of Kentucky, acting by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, and the State of Indiana, acting by and through the Indiana State Highway Commission, may enter into such cooperative agreement as may be agreed upon between said States, relating to the construction, financing, maintenance, and/or operation of such bridge, and the State of Indiana may acquire such interest in the bridge as may be agreed upon between said States, and upon such terms as may be agreed upon—all, however, subject to the limitations in this act expressly provided or necessarily implied.

Sec. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4636) authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill., and permitting the Commonwealth of Kentucky to act jointly with the State of Illinois in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and more adequately provide for military and other purposes the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, be, and it hereby is, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill., and the approaches thereto, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, and/or operation of such bridge and the approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be

the same as in condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, hereby is authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. If tolls are charged for the use of the bridge, the rates of toll to be charged shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund not to exceed an amount sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and not to exceed an amount, in addition to the foregoing, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the aggregate cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interests and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not exceeding 20 years from the date of approval of this act. In any event, tolls shall be charged on the basis aforesaid for transit over the bridge if revenue bonds of the Commonwealth of Kentucky are issued, to provide money to pay all or any part of the cost thereof, and such tolls shall be continued and adjusted at such rates as may be necessary to pay such bonds with interest thereon and any lawful premium for the retirement thereof before maturity, subject only to the power of the Secretary of War or other authorized Federal authority to regulate such rates.

After a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and approaches shall have been provided to the extent hereinabove required, the bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. Tolls shall be uniform as between individuals and as between vehicles of the same class using the bridge.

Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring tolls to be charged for the use of such bridge, except as hereinabove provided, and nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the Commonwealth of Kentucky, acting by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or its successors, from paying all or any part of the cost of such bridge and its approaches from the State road fund, or from paying all or any part of the cost of maintenance, repair, or operation of such bridge from the State road fund of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Sec. 6. At any time before or after the completion of such bridge, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, acting by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, and the State of Illinois, acting by and through the Illinois State Highway Commission, may enter into such cooperative agreement as may be agreed upon between said States, relating to the construction, financing, maintenance, and/or operation of such bridge, and the State of Illinois may acquire such interest in the bridge as may be agreed upon between said States, and upon such terms as may be agreed upon. All, however, subject to the limitations in this act expressly provided or necessarily implied.

Sec. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

BOARD OF ROAD COMMISSIONERS, ALASKA

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to take up Calendar No. 805, Senate bill 4525, providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the Board of Road Commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The reason why I make this request is that the select committee appointed by the Senate to investigate the Alaskan Railroad came to the conclusion that it was wise to transfer the trails in Alaska from the War Department to the Interior Department. It presented the matter to the War Department, the Interior Department, and the President, and the three are agreed that this transfer should be made. We are anxious to have it made, because the travel for the coming summer will soon begin.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the Board of Road Commissioners in the Territory of Alaska, and upon the Secretary of War, as provided for in the act of January 27, 1905 (ch. 277, sec. 2, 33 Stat. 616), as amended by the act of May 14, 1906 (ch. 2458, sec. 2, 34 Stat. 192), and acts supplemental thereto, and amendatory thereof, are hereby transferred to the Department of the Interior, and shall hereafter be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, or under his direction, by such officer or officers, as may be designated by him.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall execute or cause to be executed all laws pertaining to the construction and maintenance

of roads and trails and other works in Alaska, heretofore administered by said board of road commissioners under the direction of the Secretary of War; and all appropriations heretofore made, and now available, or that hereafter may be made, for expenditure by said board for meeting the cost of such work in the Territory of Alaska, are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, to be thereafter administered in accordance with the provisions of this act; and the said board is directed to turn over to the Secretary of the Interior all equipment, materials, supplies, papers, maps, and documents, or other property utilized in the exercise of such powers, for the use of the said Secretary in the administration of the construction and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, and trails, and other works in the Territory of Alaska, heretofore administered by said board.

Sec. 3. That with the approval of the President, the Secretary of the Interior shall have power, by order or regulation, to distribute the duties and authority hereby transferred, and appropriations pertaining thereto, as he may deem proper to accomplish a more economical and effective organization thereof, and to make rules and regulations governing the use of roads, trails, and other works, including the fixing and collection of tolls where deemed necessary and advisable in the public interest.

Sec. 4. That all estimates of appropriations for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails and other works, as heretofore submitted by the Secretary of War, shall hereafter be submitted by the Secretary of the Interior.

ESTATE OF ANTON W. FISCHER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2960) for the relief of the estate of Anton W. Fischer, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to refund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Anton W. Fischer, late of Owatonna, Minn., the sum of \$275.98, under existing rules and regulations, said amount having been illegally collected from said estate, as stated by letter of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue dated February 7, 1923.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF NATIVES OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (S. 4425) relating to the immigration and naturalization of certain natives of the Virgin Islands was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think we ought to have an explanation of this bill.

INCREASE IN BANKING FACILITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 4412) to provide for the safer and more effective use of the assets of Federal reserve banks and of national banking associations to regulate interbank control, to prevent the undue diversion of funds into speculative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, realizing the immediate importance of considering an appropriation bill which has already been reported and in the provisions of which we have provided for a reduction of governmental expenditures, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, to give a place to the appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill (H. R. 11267).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I want to inquire if the bill to which the Senator from Washington just referred is the bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government, including economies?

Mr. JONES. It is.

Mr. BLAINE. It is not my intention to object, but I suggest that there ought to be a quorum present, and so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Barkley	Borah	Byrnes
Austin	Bingham	Bratton	Capper
Bailey	Black	Bulkeley	Caraway
Bankhead	Blaine	Bulow	Cohen

Connally	Harrison	McKellar
Coolidge	Hastings	McNary
Copeland	Hatfield	Moses
Costigan	Hayden	Neely
Couzens	Hebert	Norbeck
Dale	Howell	Norris
Dickinson	Hull	Nye
Dill	Johnson	Oddie
Fess	Jones	Patterson
Fletcher	Kean	Pittman
Frazier	Kendrick	Reed
George	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.
Glass	King	Robinson, Ind.
Glenn	La Follette	Schall
Goldsbrough	Lewis	Sheppard
Gore	Logan	Smith
Hale	McGill	Smoot

Stephens
Thomas, Idaho
Thomas, Okla.
Townsend
Trammell
Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner
Walcott
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Watson
Wheeler
White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11267) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill may be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, let me make just a brief statement with reference to the bill. The amount carried in the bill as it passed the House was \$20,000,000. We have already by resolution provided for a reduction of \$500,000 of that amount, so that there is really left in the bill \$19,714,869. Of this amount there are items which we consider as really House matters, with which the Senate never interferes at all, amounting to \$8,178,924. That leaves \$11,535,945 that we are really to consider.

We have not been ordered to reduce the total amount of the bill by 10 per cent, the practice we have followed heretofore; but 10 per cent of that sum would be \$1,153,594.50. Reductions made by the Senate committee in reporting the bill amount to \$1,205,044, or several thousand dollars over the 10 per cent reduction plan which we have been following. That is the first part of the bill. The bill is divided, I may say, into two parts. One relates to the regular appropriations ordinarily carried in the legislative appropriation bill. The other part is the economy program upon which we have entered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say that the statement just made by the chairman of the committee about there being more than a 10 per cent reduction in the bill is correct. That idea has been carried out just as he stated. It is entirely satisfactory so far as I am concerned, and I hope the amendments reported by the committee will be adopted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think it will not be inappropriate for me to express the hope that we would like to pass the bill just as speedily as we possibly can. Every Senator, of course, knows the condition of affairs, and I am sure that everyone is just as anxious as I am to have the bill disposed of as rapidly as possible.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate—Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 8, line 19, before the word "at," to strike out "30" and insert "34," so as to read:

Laborers, 3 at \$1,320 each, 34 at \$1,260 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, at the end of line 21, to change the total appropriation for the office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate from \$247,064 to \$252,104.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 9, at the end of line 17, to strike out "\$13,000" and insert "\$7,960," so as to read:

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$7,960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 9, after the word "labor," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to read:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 15, after the words "hundred words," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to read:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 16, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That except in the case of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation no part of this appropriation shall be expended for services, personal, professional, or otherwise, in excess of the rate of \$3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, at this point I desire to offer a committee amendment which was overlooked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 25, strike out "\$60,340" and insert "\$54,306," so as to read:

For reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, payable in equal monthly installments, \$54,306.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 11, line 6, after the word "Senate," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to read:

For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended from the contingent fund of the Senate, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, United States Senate, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "House of Representatives—Office of Doorkeeper," on page 17, line 16, after the figures "\$2,760," to strike out "and \$420 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent," so as to read:

Assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,760.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this was an amendment put in by the committee. These items refer to the House work and the House proceedings. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] was especially interested in the amendment. I want to say that it is the general practice of the Senate not to interfere with matters in the House as the House does not interfere with matters connected with the operations of the Senate. However desirable the amendment might be, I really trust that the Senate will not agree to it. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that that is on account of the system of relations between the House and the Senate. I think it would be unwise for us to put in such an amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington feels that way about it, I shall not insist upon the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 17, line 21, to reduce the total for salaries, Office of Doorkeeper of the House, from "\$247,604" to "\$247,184."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 24, line 2, after the word "directory," to strike out "\$265,015" and insert "\$240,000," so as to read:

Capitol Buildings: For necessary expenditures for the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House Office Buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including minor improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies, material, fuel, oil, waste, and appurtenances; furnishings and office equipment; personal and other services; cleaning and repairing works of art; maintenance and driving of motor-propelled passenger-carrying office vehicle; pay of superintendent of meters, and \$300 additional for the maintenance of an automobile for his use, who shall inspect all gas and electric meters of the Government in the District of Columbia without additional compensation; and not exceeding \$300 for the purchase of technical and necessary reference books, periodicals, and city directory, \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 2, to strike out:

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after the words "Revised Statutes," to strike out "\$120,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to read:

Capitol Grounds: For care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings; Capitol Power Plant; personal and other services; care of trees; plantings; fertilizers; repairs to pavements, walks, and roadways; purchase of waterproof wearing apparel; maintenance of signal lights; and for snow removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract without compliance with sections 3709 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) and 3744 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 16) of the Revised Statutes, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 18, after the word "agent," to strike out "\$203,129" and insert "\$175,000," so as to read:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items, and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment and for labor and material incident thereto and repairs thereof; and for personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, acting through the Architect of the Capitol, who shall be its executive agent, \$175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 16, to strike out "\$359,450" and insert "\$325,000," so as to read:

Capitol power plant: For lighting, heating, and power for the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings, Supreme Court Building, Congressional Library Buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Capitol garages, folding and storage rooms of the Senate, Government Printing Office, and Washington City post office; personal and other services, engineering instruments, fuel, oil, materials, labor, advertising, and purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, in connection with the maintenance and operation of the heating, lighting, and power plant, \$325,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 3, after the word "thereto," to strike out "\$137,000" and insert "\$125,000," so as to read:

For the installation of duplicate steam lines to new buildings; clean-water intake screens and auxiliaries and high-tension switching equipment, including all necessary work in connection with such installation, and for all labor, materials, travel expenses and subsistence therefor; and without regard to section 35 of the public buildings act, approved June 25, 1910, as amended, or the classification act of 1923, as amended, for employment of all necessary personnel, including architectural, engineering, and professional services and other assistants, and for all other expenses incident thereto, \$125,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library Building and grounds—Salaries," on page 27, line 16, after the figures "\$46,960," to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the Architect of the Capitol may continue the employment under his jurisdiction of Damon W. Harding, but not beyond June 30, 1934, notwithstanding any provision of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and

any amendment thereof, prohibiting extensions of service for more than four years after the age of retirement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, at the end of line 2, to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,000," so as to read:

For trees, shrubs, plants, fertilizers, and skilled labor for the grounds of Library of Congress, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, at the end of line 8, to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$13,500," so as to read:

For necessary expenditures for the Library Building under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including minor improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies, material, and appurtenances, and personal and other services in connection with the mechanical and structural maintenance of such building, \$13,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 11, to strike out "\$13,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to read:

For furniture, including partitions, screens, shelving, and electrical work pertaining thereto and repairs thereof, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 11, to strike out:

To continue carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress," approved June 13, 1930 (46 Stat. 583), \$500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Botanic Garden," on page 29, line 4, after the words "Joint Committee on the Library," to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the quarters, heat, light, fuel, and telephone service heretofore furnished for the director's use in the Botanic Garden shall not be regarded as a part of his salary or compensation, and such allowances may continue to be so furnished without deduction from his salary or compensation notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 5, 1928 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 678), or any other law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 10, after the words "Joint Committee on the Library," to strike out "\$47,300" and insert "\$40,000," so as to read:

Maintenance, operation, repairs, and improvements: For all necessary expenses incident to maintaining, operating, repairing, and improving the Botanic Garden, and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and equipment pertaining thereto, including procuring fertilizers, soil, tools, trees, shrubs, plants, and seeds; materials and miscellaneous supplies, including rubber boots and aprons when required for use by employees in connection with their work; not to exceed \$25 for emergency medical supplies; disposition of waste; traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence of the director and his assistants not to exceed \$975; street-car fares not exceeding \$25; office equipment and contingent expenses; the prevention and eradication of insect and other pests and plant diseases by purchase of materials and procurement of personal services by contract without regard to the provisions of any other act; repair, maintenance, and operation of motor trucks and passenger motor vehicle; not to exceed \$2,500 for purchase and exchange of a motor truck; purchase of botanical books, periodicals, and books of reference, not to exceed \$100; repairs and improvements to director's residence; and all other necessary expenses; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 11, before the word "may," to strike out "\$300" and insert "\$100," so as to read:

The sum of \$100 may be expended at any one time by the Botanic Garden for the purchase of plants, trees, shrubs, and other nursery stock, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress," on page 31, line 9, after the word "Librarian," to strike out "\$74,790" and insert "\$60,000," so as to read:

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ competent persons to gather, classify, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for or bearing upon legislation, and to render such data service-

able to Congress and committees and Members thereof, including not to exceed \$5,700 for employees engaged on piecework and work by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$62,010" and insert "\$55,000," and in line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$180,000" and insert "\$160,000," so as to read:

DISTRIBUTION OF CARD INDEXES

For the distribution of card indexes and other publications of the Library, including personal services, freight charges (not exceeding \$500), expressage, postage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, and including not to exceed \$55,000 for employees engaged in piecework and work by the day or hour and for extra special services of regular employees at rates to be fixed by the Librarian; in all, \$160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Index to State legislation," on page 32, line 16, before the word "and," to strike out "\$41,460" and insert "\$25,000," so as to read:

INDEX TO STATE LEGISLATION

To enable the Librarian of Congress to prepare an index to the legislation of the several States, together with a supplemental digest of the more important legislation, as authorized and directed by the act entitled "An act providing for the preparation of a biennial index to State legislation," approved February 10, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 2, secs. 164, 165), including personal and other services within and without the District of Columbia including not to exceed \$2,500 for special and temporary service at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, travel, necessary material and apparatus, and for printing and binding the indexes and digests of State legislation for official distribution only, and other printing and binding incident to the work of compilation, stationery, and incidentals, \$25,000, and in addition the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1932 is reappropriated for the fiscal year 1933.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Union Catalogues," on page 33, at the end of line 19, to strike out "\$24,000" and insert "\$20,000," so as to read:

To continue the development and maintenance of the Union Catalogues, including personal services within and without the District of Columbia (and not to exceed \$1,400 for special and temporary service, including extra special services of regular employees, at rates to be fixed by the Librarian), travel, necessary material and apparatus, stationery, photostat supplies, and incidentals, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, after the figures "1934," to strike out "\$130,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to read:

INCREASE OF THE LIBRARY

For purchase of books, miscellaneous periodicals and newspapers, and all other material, for the increase of the Library, including payment in advance for subscription books and society publications, and for freight, commissions, and traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian in the interest of collections, and all other expenses incidental to the acquisition of books, miscellaneous periodicals and newspapers, and all other material for the increase of the Library, by purchase, gift, bequest, or exchange, to continue available during the fiscal year 1934, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 11, after the designation "Chief Justice," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to read:

For purchase of books and for periodicals for the law library, under the direction of the Chief Justice, \$40,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to inquire what has been the appropriation in past years, under the direction of the Chief Justice of the United States, for the purchase of books for the library of the Supreme Court?

Mr. JONES. My recollection is that the last bill provided an appropriation of \$50,000. We thought they could slack up on the purchase of law books this year to the extent of \$10,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Without any disposition to prolong the discussion, I desire to say that it seems to me improper to hamper the Supreme Court of the United States, a coor-

dinate branch of the Government, which has no political influence and can not secure a dollar by its own efforts. To say the least, noblesse oblige has fled when we begin to hamper a coordinate branch, to wit, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the purchase of law books for its use.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. The committee was informed that the price of law books had decreased materially and that the Supreme Court would be able to purchase about the same number of law books for \$40,000 as they have formerly purchased for \$50,000.

Mr. ASHURST. That is a good explanation.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I think in all probability that this appropriation could be cut to \$25,000 instead of \$45,000. It is probable that the Supreme Court can get along with a considerable less number of law books for their law library. I think if one goes through the library he would realize that to be so.

That item is to provide new publications, a majority of which are probably never looked at at all by the Justices of the Supreme Court. I would rather see a greater reduction in items of this character instead of taking 10 per cent off the salaries of employees who are only making \$600, \$800, or \$1,200 a year. It would work less detrimentally to reduce items of this character than in such a heartless way to reduce the compensation of employees who are only earning salaries in many cases of a thousand or eleven hundred or twelve hundred dollars a year.

I have not had an opportunity to study the bill, but I understand it proposes a flat reduction in compensation of Federal employees of 10 per cent, regardless of the salary now received. If there is any such condition that necessitates or justifies such a radical and drastic action as that, then I think, in all justice, salaries should be decreased upon a graduated basis. The salary of an employee who is now receiving \$1,200 a year should not be cut in equal percentage with the salary of the employee receiving \$5,000 a year, or \$10,000 a year, or \$20,000 a year. So I think if we are going to cut by 10 per cent the salaries of employees now receiving such small salaries, we had better eliminate some of the items of the character now under consideration.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I will yield in a moment. If the whole appropriation in this instance were eliminated, no one would be hurt, no one would be injured; but when we begin to cut the salaries of those who are earning the minimum to the extent of 10 per cent a year, we are going to inflict some hardships and some deprivations and very serious injury not only on the persons drawing such salaries but on others who are dependent more or less upon them.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator think that a graduated scale of reduction, commencing at 5 per cent and going as high as 15 per cent, would be preferable?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think it would be decidedly preferable. A majority of those who are receiving the larger salaries have been placed in the higher-salaried brackets by manipulation and by favoritism. One can go into many of the Government departments here and find employees sitting alongside of one another in a particular unit, doing a similar class of work, who are drawing salaries which vary greatly. One has been more fortunate than another and probably draws a salary of \$4,000 when another employee is only drawing \$1,800 a year. Such distinctions in salary classifications have arisen, and are, more or less, due to favoritism and discrimination. Yet it is proposed further to penalize the employees who have been so unfortunate as to receive only small salaries by reducing them 10 per cent.

We passed the reclassification act three or four years ago. The intention and purpose of Congress in passing that act was that the underpaid and those in the lower-salary brackets should receive a substantial increase. What was the consequence? Most of them received only \$40 or \$60 per annum increase, while the employees who were getting sal-

aries of three or four or five or six thousand dollars, forsooth, received increases ranging up to eight or nine hundred dollars per annum under the reclassification act that was supposed to do justice to the underpaid employees and those in the lower-salary brackets. That has been the consequence. Under the flat 10 per cent reduction proposal there will be done to them further injustice.

I think there should be a decrease in salaries; I have expressed myself along that line repeatedly on the floor; but I am in favor of making the basis for the reduction start at the top with a larger percentage and reducing the percentage of reduction as the lower-salary brackets are reached.

Mr. JONES. I was just going to suggest that probably it will be more effective to discuss this question when we reach it. I do not, however, want to cut the Senator off.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I was merely making some observations—

Mr. JONES. Very well.

Mr. TRAMMELL. About the tender consideration manifested on the part of the committee for inanimate property, such as law books, in only reducing the appropriation for their purchase \$10,000 in an item of \$50,000, when, in all probability, there is no necessity and no particular use for making the appropriation at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is not a question of what we would like to do; it is a question of what we are going to have to do. Certainly I would be one of the last persons to object to liberal appropriations for the purchase of law books for the Supreme Court, but we are going to have to cut down on many things; and the more we cut down on items of this kind the less we shall have to cut down on the salaries of employees who, in the city of Washington, at least, can now hardly live on their salaries. I realize that. No Senator who is not on the Appropriations Committee and who has not followed this bill through can suggest proper cuts on various items of this kind; but, Mr. President, the Supreme Court would live, the country would live and get along pretty well, if for a year or two we did not buy any law books for the Supreme Court. I had rather cut out the item entirely than to cut the salaries of men and women who at present, especially in this city under existing living conditions, are not getting enough to support a family.

I myself think it is very appropriate for the Senator from Florida or for any other Senator to do what the Senator has done. If we let such items as this go through, when we come to the place in the bill where salaries are provided for, then it may be said, "We have been appropriating so much money that there has got to be this cut on the small salaries." There will be a good many instances, it seems to me, where there even should be an increase in an appropriation in order to keep things going, but we shall not be able to get it; and perhaps in other places there should be no decrease, where it will be necessary to keep the appropriation as it is at present.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe we are subject to just criticism if we say to the Supreme Court and to the other courts, "We are not going to appropriate the amount which we have heretofore been appropriating for the purchase of law books." We have been appropriating a great deal of money for law books, commencing with the Supreme Court and running down through all our courts. The Supreme Court has been getting about \$50,000 a year for law books. I admit that. I should like to have them continue to get it; but I had rather reduce that appropriation than to take the food out of the mouths of hungry people; I had rather reduce that appropriation and use the money to give employment to somebody who is anxious to have work in order to support himself and family and can not get it. It seems to me we are going to confront the proposition that we must cut out some of these appropriations or we shall not be able to do what we have been admonished it is necessary for us to do in order to obtain a balanced Budget.

I have not been one of the Senators who have believed that the balancing of the Budget was necessary to save the life of the Nation; but from the President down, a majority of all our officials seemed to think that is true. Everybody

will admit that it is very desirable; that we ought to do it if we can; that eventually we must do it; that we can not permanently continue as a Government with an unbalanced Budget; otherwise in time we would eat ourselves up; but here is an opportunity, it seems to me, to cut out a part of an appropriation at least without doing any great injury to anybody. The committee has reduced the appropriation as it came from the House by \$10,000; but it seems to me, Mr. President, that, under existing circumstances, we ought to cut it lower than the committee.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] recently advised the Senate that this appropriation of \$40,000, owing to the recent decrease in the price of law books, would purchase the same number of law books as has been heretofore purchased; so I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. If the Senator from Nebraska does not desire to make a motion to reduce the appropriation, I desire to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I am going to make a motion to that effect before I sit down.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I beg pardon.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desired to make this explanation, because I did not want to be misunderstood, and I do not think the Senate will misunderstand me. When we are face to face with the proposition that somewhere we have got to cut down the expenses of the Government to the extent of \$300,000,000, we ought to cut them down where such action will do as little injury as possible, and we ought to let it be known that we are doing it because of the necessity of the situation.

Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out \$40,000 and inserting \$25,000.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO THE SENATE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I hesitate to detain the Senate even for a few minutes while it is trying to pass these appropriation bills. My only reason for occupying just a few moments of the Senate's time now is because of what I believe to be a misrepresentation to the American people as reported this morning with reference to what happened yesterday and during the last few days in the passage of the tax bill.

Of course, there can be no glory for any party in passing a revenue bill that imposes additional taxes of more than a billion dollars directly upon the American people; but one reading the newspapers of this morning—not all, but some of them—would gather the impression that the United States Senate has been frittering away precious time, denying the necessities for Government revenue, and refusing to balance the Budget and thereby sustain the credit of the Government. Some of the press go so far as to give the impression that the Paul Revere ride of the President yesterday to this Chamber bludgeoned the Senate into the passage of the revenue bill, and that if it had not been for that sensational and historic ride perhaps we would still be here considering the revenue bill.

I know that no one will take issue with what I am going to say, and if I misstate the facts I want to be corrected, because facts are a part of the history of this Government. I say that the President's visit to the Senate yesterday did not hasten in the slightest the consideration and completion of the revenue bill.

Of course, no one should find fault with the President, and certainly I do not. If he wanted to come here and confer with the Senate, express his views, and have his name carried on the front page of many papers as having browbeaten the Senate into action, he had a right to do so; but I say that the revenue bill would have been completed yesterday whether or not the President had come to the Senate.

I doubt if in all the history of this Government any important piece of legislation has ever been considered and

passed in a manner so free from the slightest tinge of partisanship as this revenue measure. It has not crept in a single time. Senators on this side of the aisle as well as on the other side have differed, both upon the floor of the Senate and in the committee, but there has been a unanimity unexcelled in parliamentary history in a desire to meet the demands of the Government and preserve its credit by providing revenue to balance the Budget. The Congress of the United States is not to be blamed in the slightest, and can not be by anyone who wants to be fair for any unreasonable delay in the consideration of this bill.

Why some editorial penmen, either in order to curry favor with the White House or to distort the facts, should try to arouse the American people against the Senate of the United States because of what it has done in the consideration of this bill is inconceivable to me. It plays no part in orderly government; and whatever function a journalist performs, the highest conception should be—and that applies to everyone else—that the facts be made known and the truth be told.

Whatever delay there was in the last few days was occasioned by differences of opinion with reference to the amount required to balance the Budget. It will be recalled that in the beginning of this session of Congress the Secretary of the Treasury went before the Ways and Means Committee and said that a certain amount was required in order to balance the Budget. The Ways and Means Committee acted upon that suggestion and upon that authority. They prepared a bill that would have balanced the Budget upon those estimates. Then the Secretary of the Treasury again came before them and said he needed an additional sum of \$200,000,000 in order to balance it. Immediately it was given, and the bill was written according to the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury by the House of Representatives.

The bill came here. The Secretary of the Treasury came before the Finance Committee in April, when we had our first meeting. I think about the next day after the bill had passed the House, because under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee we wanted to expedite its consideration in every possible way. Immediately the Secretary of the Treasury came before us and told us how much money was needed to balance the Budget. We went to work on that theory; and from that time until May 8, when we had concluded the consideration of the bill and were ready to report it, only some three weeks ago, we asked that the Secretary of the Treasury come before the committee, or he got into communication with the chairman or others and came before the committee, and the question was then put to him, "How much do you need to balance the Budget?" He then submitted his estimate. That was three weeks ago, and the committee then got together and we brought out a bill that complied with his every request, so far as meeting his estimate.

We proceeded along that line with very much difficulty. Finally the bill was about to be completed, no longer than a day more being required, because the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] will recall that last week the request was made that we stay here even on Saturday, and it was the opinion of many of us that we could have passed it then, but it was in the air that there was some difference about this estimate; that the Treasury perhaps was wrong in its estimate. The Treasury had not come before the Finance Committee or before the Senate and suggested a revision of its estimates. Indeed, up until Monday of this week it had stood upon the estimate that it had presented to the Finance Committee of the Senate on May 8.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask when the Secretary of the Treasury first appeared before the committee with reference to the last estimate?

Mr. HARRISON. The Secretary of the Treasury first appeared before the committee, I think, April 13 or 18.

The last time, when we had finished the bill and were ready to report it, was May 8, three weeks ago. This last week in the Senate we had practically balanced the Budget. We had finished the job. There were only two or three immaterial amendments left that the committee had reported; but enough of us who had voted against the Connally amendment upon the floor of the Senate had made up our minds in order to meet this situation and balance the Budget and give us a surplus over it, to reverse our action, get a reconsideration of the amendment, and vote for the Connally amendment. That would have given a surplus over the estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

On Monday we received an invitation to go to the White House. We went there Monday night, and for the first time officially it was represented, at least to the minority members of the Finance Committee, by the Secretary of the Treasury that more money was needed in order to balance the Budget.

Mr. BORAH. That was Monday night?

Mr. HARRISON. That was Monday night, this week—day before yesterday—in the presence of the President of the United States. In that conference, may I say—and I am violating none of the proprieties of that dignified occasion when I say this—it was not hinted, it was not suggested, that the President was going to come down here on a moment's notice the next day, nor did anyone inquire whether it would be necessary for him to come.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it not a fact that there was a disposition on the part of a large number of Senators to pass the bill on Monday night; and is it not the judgment of the Senator that the bill would have been passed Monday, except for the speech made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who is generally considered on this floor to be particularly close to the Treasury Department, in which he announced that \$250,000,000 or \$300,000,000 more would be required; and did not the Senate stop in its process of passing the bill in order to let the minority members of the Finance Committee go to the White House that night?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has stated the facts correctly, because there were several requests made on Monday that we should abolish the 7.30 adjournment time in order to pass the bill that night. The first intimation to the contrary from an official source came from the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania—and I am not criticizing him about it; he just had more information; he was closer to the powers that be than we were—when he burst upon the country with the startling news that had been given in roundabout ways to some of us in whispers, under the pledge of secrecy, for fear that if we repeated it to anyone it might startle business. It might destroy every particle of confidence left. It would be terrible. Yet after it had come to us in such a way as that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania gives it here upon this great sounding board to the Nation.

So they held up the bill, and they would not let us balance the Budget on Monday according to the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury upon which we relied; and, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] knows, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] knows, some of us, a majority of us on this side, went through without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." We took them item by item.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. In order to get this record as I should like to have it, the Secretary of the Treasury gave his first official notice of the necessity of revamping his estimates yesterday morning, when the committee met?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and the first official intimation was given in the White House conference, in the presence of the President and the Democratic members of the Finance

Committee and some others, on Monday night of this week; and when the Secretary of the Treasury that night was asked to tell us the exact amount that was needed to balance the Budget, he said it would be impossible for him to do it at that time, but his experts were working on it and the amount would be furnished.

May I say that the experts who were working upon it were the very experts who were with the Finance Committee every moment of the time it considered the bill. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, a very efficient and able member of the President's official family, was in the committee room practically all the time; and not until Monday night of this week, at the White House conference, did we receive an official intimation that more money was required. Then the request was, "Give the estimate to us. Let us know what it is." And on Tuesday morning—

Mr. NORRIS. That is, yesterday morning.

Mr. HARRISON. Yesterday morning the distinguished Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee, called the Finance Committee to meet at 9.30 o'clock, and we met. The Secretary of the Treasury came before us, a little delayed, but we waited patiently, because we wanted the information; he got there something before 10. We went immediately to work, because we appreciated the gravity of the situation. We wanted to cooperate, we wanted the Budget balanced. We wanted the world to know that this great Government here, foremost among the nations of the world in wealth, in resources, and in finance, was able to balance its Budget, and would do it speedily, without any partisanship.

So it was that within two hours, aye, less than that, within less than an hour and a half, after the Secretary came before the committee and told us that we needed \$285,000,000 more in order to balance the Budget, we were ready to make our report to the Senate. In the \$285,000,000 the Secretary was including the amount he estimated would be raised under the Connally amendment. At that time the Connally amendment had not been adopted, but the plans were made, there was not a doubt in the mind of a single man but that the required votes would be cast as soon as the Senate convened in order to adopt the Connally amendment. It had been agreed by unanimous consent the day before that it would be voted on at not later than 10.30 o'clock on yesterday morning.

We left the committee room, came back to the Senate, and voted on the Connally amendment. It was carried by a vote of 86 to 3. Of course, the sentiment was for it, because, as I have said, Democrats and Republicans—all Senators—wanted to balance the Budget.

So it was put through. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his recommendation for \$285,000,000, included not only the Connally amendment, acceptance of which was a foregone conclusion, but he suggested the manufacturers' sales tax.

We told him then what the world knew—because there was no secrecy about it; there was no hesitancy about it—that 55 Members of the Senate had signed a statement that they would not vote for a sales tax, because they were against it or believed it inopportune to add it to the revenue bill, knowing it would cause delay and add confusion to the consideration of the bill and might prolong the discussion, in view of the action of the House and other circumstances.

So when the Secretary of the Treasury suggested the manufacturers' sales tax we said, "That is out of the question. Give us an alternative." Then he said, "Put on a gasoline tax, which will raise \$150,000,000, and put a tax upon electricity and gas, which will raise \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000."

That was about 11.20 o'clock yesterday morning, before the President came, and we were ready to vote. The votes were there. We had counted noses. We had a majority.

We pleaded that a vote be taken immediately in the Finance Committee. I went over to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who had made the motion to adopt the gasoline tax and the electricity proposal, and I said, "Let us have a vote. We have the votes to put the amendments on the bill." I spoke to the chairman of the committee. I

spoke to the leader on the Republican side. I said, "Let us finish the job."

Then we heard that the President of the United States was coming to the Senate, that he was going to deliver a message. I was fearful that his coming might confuse the issue. I was afraid that the message might be couched in such language that it would prolong the debate, and we were anxious to get the matter out of the committee, in order that we could come before the Senate, even before the President came here, and say, "Here is our recommendation. Let us put it over and the Budget will be balanced." Why, the Senate had even recessed yesterday morning to give the Finance Committee time to consider means of providing for the increased revenue.

There was not a single vote influenced, either in the committee or upon the floor of the Senate, in my opinion, by the President's coming here yesterday. The bill would have been passed last night if he had not come, because we wanted to preserve the credit of this Government.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. May I remind the Senator that on Monday afternoon about 4 o'clock, prior to any notice of a deficiency in the tax bill, there was a meeting with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] in the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations of a group of us who were opposed to the general sales tax, and it was agreed at that time by Members from both sides of the Chamber to accept the Connally amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. COUZENS. So that the Treasury Department had nothing to do with recommending that, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is absolutely right, and may I state while the Senator is on his feet that there is no member of the committee who has acted in a finer way and more patriotically and has put his shoulder to the wheel with more vigor in order to balance the Budget than has the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understand the Senator from Mississippi, what he says is that the Committee on Finance was in the act of voting on the amendments that were afterwards adopted, to finish the balancing of the Budget, and postponed the casting of the vote to hear what the President had to say, and immediately returned to the committee room and did what it had intended to do all the time.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and the adjournment was over the protest of those who were going to vote for the proposal and wanted to report it out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has just made the point I wanted to make. The majority of the committee wanted to act on these recommendations before 11.30, and the Senator from Connecticut went so far to prevent any action prior to 12 o'clock as to withdraw his motion, and refused to let it be considered until after 12 o'clock.

Mr. HARRISON. That is absolutely right. I am sure there is no statement I have made which would be contradicted by either the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi whether or not the White House and the Secretary of the Treasury were given assurance on Monday night that the committee was ready to balance the Budget and to pass the bill the next day?

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely. We have been ready all the time. I have not made this statement with the idea of precipitating any further discussion here. I am glad the bill is on its way. I hope the conferees will expedite its consideration and report it back to the House and the Senate just as quickly as possible.

I have made this statement in the interest of fairness; there is no reason for criminations or recriminations either

against the White House or the Congress of the United States. All of us want to balance the Budget; we want the economic situation saved; we want the credit of our Government preserved, and that is what we have tried to do in this crisis in our country's history.

Mr. WATSON rose.

Mr. HARRISON. I have finished, unless the Senator from Indiana wants to ask me a question.

Mr. WATSON. I just want to make an observation, Mr. President, to which the Senator may or may not want to respond.

I know of nobody who is disputing what the Senator says. This recital of events, from the beginning up to this time, is entirely correct. In my experience in public life, in committees, I have never known of anybody more heartily and more sympathetically cooperating in the consideration and passage of a measure than did the Senator from Mississippi in connection with the tax bill. I do not know what the fuss is about.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator may not have been in the Chamber when I started my remarks. I prefaced what I had to say, which may have been unnecessary, by the statement that some of the press of the country was still taking it out on the Senate in an attempt to misrepresent the facts, in order to extol the President of the United States on his historic ride to the Senate yesterday.

Mr. WATSON. If the Senator is going to pick up something in a newspaper and make a speech about it, of course, I can not help that. There is nobody here, as far as I know, who is disputing one link in the chain of events the Senator has recited.

Mr. HARRISON. I knew that, and I am glad the Senator states it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I just want to take this occasion to express my deepest appreciation for the splendid cooperation we have received in the Finance Committee from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and I might name the others, but there is no need for it.

I have been in the Senate nearly 30 years; I have been on the Finance Committee since 1909, cooperating in the passing of every tariff bill and all the legislation that goes to that committee during those years, and I never have experienced or witnessed such unity of purpose as there has been in the passage of the revenue bill which was passed in the Senate last night.

During the hearings and in the meetings there has not been an intimation of partisanship from the moment we began the consideration of the bill until the time it was passed in the Senate. I thank every member of the committee with all my heart. If there had not been the cooperation, I am sure we could not have passed the bill, at least for months to come. I not only want the members of the committee and every Member of the Senate, but I want the country as a whole to understand the situation.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I assume that no one would cast any reflection on the President of the United States, and I do not conceive that the Senator from Mississippi meant anything of that kind. Undoubtedly the President had a right to come to the Senate and address us. He chose a time when undoubtedly he felt it was absolutely essential he should come. He could not have come at any other time, if he expected to address the Senate in the midst of what he supposed was the confusion in which we were laboring at that time.

Undoubtedly the President of the United States has been as much worried and disturbed and distressed over the condition of the country, in fact, over the condition of the whole world resulting from the conditions in this country, as anybody could be in all the broad realm of the world, and he believed it to be his duty to come and address the Senate.

I did not know the President of the United States contemplated coming to the Senate. Nobody had told me anything about it. I was not asked about it or consulted about it. I do not know who consulted the President about it. I do not know whom he asked about it. He did not consult the Senator from Utah. He did not have to consult any of us.

The first I heard of his coming was during the meeting of the Finance Committee, when I stepped out into an ante-room to consult with the Secretary of the Treasury about a matter, and he told me the President was coming. Previous to that I had had a conference with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and I turned and told him that the President was coming to speak to the Senate.

Of course, the President had the right to come. I assume that if he believed it proper, it was his duty to come. I do not believe he is subject to any criticism for having come, and I have no doubt that every man who has labored to get the revenue bill in shape and to pass it, from the day we started on it until we passed it last night at midnight, is willing to give the President credit for patriotic motives and for honest purposes in coming here, even at the time he did.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to propound a question to himself and to the honorable chairman of the Finance Committee: Is it not true, I ask these eminent gentlemen, the leaders in the relative places they occupy, that it can be certified with complete truth that the President of the United States, after he had come and expressed such views as were and might be necessary and appropriate, received on both sides of the Chamber the same immediate cooperation and warm support, to the best of the conscientious ability of Members of the Senate, that has ever been accorded to a President of our country?

Mr. WATSON. I have never known anything finer in my political experience.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator that, of course, I said nothing that would reflect upon the President?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly not.

Mr. HARRISON. I said that the President had a perfect right to come; but let me read to the Senator an expression from the chairman of the Republican National Committee, a distinguished Senator in this body, which adds confusion to the situation, and I think that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ought to show the true facts. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] said, according to the article in the Herald Tribune of this morning:

The Finance Committee was so strongly impressed with the message of the President and the serious situation disclosed that the proposals for balancing the Budget were recommended in an hour after the President spoke.

As I have shown, the Finance Committee had agreed to report the measures recommended a half hour before we heard the President was coming.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11267) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, line 12, after the words "Chief Justice," in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$25,000."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the idea expressed by the Senator from Nebraska; at least I know that these books may not be absolutely necessary at this time, and very likely the business of the court will go along just as well with \$25,000 as with the larger amount. I hardly think we ought to cut it lower than that, but I am perfectly satisfied with the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had addressed the Chair, but I will not delay action on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, at the end of line 20, to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$90,000," so as to read:

To enable the Librarian of Congress to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 2, sec. 135a), \$90,000.

Mr. BORAH. What is that amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state it.

The Chief Clerk again stated the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this is an economy bill.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me, as it is an economy bill presenting an entire program covering the subject of economy, that before we begin, in order that we may have a proper conception of the entire program with which we are dealing, some one ought to explain the program and tell of what the economies consist.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the portion of the bill up to page 44 is the regular legislative appropriation bill and we have not reached the provisions embodied in the economy program as yet. When we get to them, I am sure the chairman of the committee will make a full explanation.

Mr. BORAH. The point with me is that this portion of the bill seems to be important in connection with the economy program.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator what I said when we began the consideration of this bill, that the estimates came from the Bureau of the Budget, the bill passed the House with the reductions, and the Senate has made a still further reduction along the line that it has adopted with reference to other appropriation bills, namely, a reduction of 10 per cent even below the House appropriations. Then there is a general provision at the close of the bill covering the economy legislative features, which takes care of any changes that we may make along that line.

Mr. BORAH. Why should we not now have a discussion of that portion of the bill? This bill has just come into the Senate this morning; nobody has had any chance to read the bill or read the report except in the most casual way. I do not want to interfere with the Senator's program, but it is an exceedingly important measure.

Mr. JONES. I assume that when we get through with the committee amendments in the regular appropriating part of the bill, then, of course, the other part will be fully explained and fully discussed. I thought that was the appropriate procedure.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee something about the subject matter commencing in line 1, page 35, and ending in line 11. It contains no appropriation, but it extends an appropriation heretofore made. Can the chairman of the committee give us any information as to how much money is involved there and what the unexpended portion of the appropriation is?

Mr. JONES. There is comparatively little. There are four volumes of the Journals of the Continental Congress that are supposed to be printed. The text of the bill accurately explains what the item is. We have started the publication of the Journals of the Continental Congress, and now we are going to publish volumes 30, 31, 32, and 33. They are to be completed and paid for. The fourth volume of the Records of the Virginia Company, work on which has been started heretofore, will be the final one.

Mr. NORRIS. I notice the bill provides for "the rebinding, in full morocco, of the papers of George Washington, 302 volumes." Did George write that many books?

Mr. JONES. They have gotten the writings of George Washington together and apparently they comprise that many books. It is in connection with the work of the Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to know how much the bicentennial celebration that has been going on for three or four months, and is going on right now, and which nobody notices, has cost the Government of the United States?

Mr. JONES. I do not know exactly the aggregate; but, taking all the appropriations, I should say the cost has been

about \$1,200,000 or \$1,300,000. I want to say to the Senator that I have attempted to frame a provision, with a reduced appropriation, which will complete the work instead of having it continue indefinitely.

Mr. NORRIS. This will complete it?

Mr. JONES. That is what I expect to be done from the appropriations made in this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. How much does it cost the Government to print these 302 volumes "in full morocco," and how many copies are going to be thus bound, and what is going to be done with them?

Mr. JONES. I really can not give the Senator that information, but it will not cost any large sum. The work is done under the Bicentennial Commission, and the money, as I understand from them, will be paid largely from that source.

Mr. NORRIS. What is this item of \$50,000 that the Senate has put in place of \$58,000, in lines 12 and 13, "for the publication of the Catalogue of the Title Entries"?

Mr. JONES. That is under the Copyright Office.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JONES. The wording expresses exactly what the item is for.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not quite understand what it is.

Mr. JONES. We provided for a reduction in the speed with which this catalogue would be printed; that is all.

Mr. NORRIS. It is an annual publication, is it not?

Mr. JONES. It may be.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there not a catalogue printed every year?

Mr. JONES. That may be.

Mr. NORRIS. Will it cost \$50,000 to print the catalogue?

Mr. JONES. The estimate is \$58,000, and that is what the House provided. I do not remember now whether the estimate of the Budget is above that or not, but I know that the House committee went into the matter very carefully. After going into it they recommended an appropriation of \$58,000, and the estimate, I am informed by the clerk of the committee, is \$54,000.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the use of this catalogue, who uses it, and what is it for?

Mr. JONES. I suppose that those interested in such matters consult those catalogues and use them very largely in the office, and probably the catalogues also are on sale, so that those who are interested in copyrighting their articles may be able to see whether the copyright has been duplicated or not.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to his colleague?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I am familiar with the Copyright Office, and if the Senator will stop to think for a minute he will recognize the tremendous number of new articles being copyrighted all the time. Every one of them pays a copyright fee, and that money goes into the Treasury. These catalogues bring up to date the list of copyrighted articles.

Mr. NORRIS. What are the catalogue cards that seem to cost \$138,000?

Mr. DILL. I take it that they are the cards to which reference is made in the library as to the location of these many new articles. Why the appropriation should be so large, I do not know, but I remind the Senator of the fact that there are a tremendous number of new things, new music, new books, new publications, and every kind of thing being copyrighted all the time; they pay a fee, and the Government makes a profit out of this work all the time.

Mr. JONES. It more than pays expenses.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall the testimony—I have it not before me—but as I recall it, the profit is greater than the appropriation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not want to anticipate what is coming up, but if the Senator from Washington will answer a question or two about a section over in the economy part of the bill, even though he normally would not want to go into that now, it will save a lot of time later on. So I am going to take the liberty of directing the Senator's

attention to section 210, on page 56, and I wish to point out this situation to him.

As I understand, there are certain men who work regularly every night, and because they work at night they receive a slightly higher pay than do the men who perform the same work in the daytime. As I understand, it is proposed, first of all, to take that extra pay away from them, and then, in addition to that, to cut 10 per cent off their remaining pay. If that is true, this particular group would suffer a 20 per cent reduction in salary, while all other groups would suffer only a 10 per cent reduction. Perhaps that is not so; I can not just make out from a hasty reading of the bill; but if I could get the actual picture of that I could intelligently answer a great volume of mail that I have, and prepare an amendment if one is necessary.

Mr. JONES. I do not understand that there will be any double reductions in pay.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator, in order to make it clear, that the section provides that there shall not be paid a higher rate of compensation for those who work at night than is paid to those who work in the daytime.

Under existing law those who work at night—I am not talking about substitutes, but I am talking about regular night employees—now receive a slightly higher pay than those who work in the daytime. If it is proposed to cut the compensation of these men only 10 per cent along with all other Government employees, I do not want to protest; but if it is proposed to take their extra pay away and then cut them 10 per cent besides, obviously they would suffer a 15 or 20 per cent reduction in their pay, while other Government employees would suffer only a 10 per cent reduction.

Mr. JONES. It is certainly not the intention to make a double reduction.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not think so. I think the purpose of it, if I may transgress on the time of the Senator a moment further—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us to what page he is referring?

Mr. TYDINGS. Page 56, section 210. I think the purpose of this provision was to discourage those who worked in the daytime from making extra hours at night, so that that work might be given to a night man.

Mr. JONES. I think that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I think the way it is worded it will serve not only to take away the regular night man's extra compensation but, under the general cut, further reduce his salary, thereby giving to that class of employees two cuts instead of one. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the committee, so that those who have it in charge might correct the situation if that is the case.

Mr. JONES. The committee will look into it carefully.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 34, line 25, after the words "Library Building," to strike out "\$214,500" and insert "\$190,000," so as to read:

For miscellaneous printing and binding for the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, and the binding, rebinding, and repairing of library books, and for the Library Building, \$190,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 13, after the name "Copyright Office," to strike out "\$58,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

For the publication of the Catalogue of Title Entries of the Copyright Office, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, at the end of line 14, to strike out "\$138,400" and insert "\$120,000," so as to read:

For the printing of catalogue cards, \$120,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Library," on page 35, line 23, after the word "Librarian," to strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$7,500," so as to read:

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, stationery, supplies, stock, and materials directly purchased, miscellaneous traveling expenses, postage, transportation, incidental expenses connected with the administration of the Library and Copyright Office, including not exceeding \$500 for expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 4, to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000," so as to read:

For paper, chemicals, and miscellaneous supplies necessary for the operation of the photoduplicating machines of the Library and the making of photoduplicate prints, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library Building," on page 36, line 12, after the word "Librarian," to strike out "\$5,100" and insert "\$4,500," so as to read:

For extra services of employees and additional employees under the Librarian to provide for the opening of the Library Building on Sundays and on legal holidays, at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 12, to strike out:

For special and temporary services in connection with the custody, care, and maintenance of the Library Building, including extra special services of regular employees at the discretion of the Librarian, at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 18, after the word "services," to strike out "rubber boots, rubber coats, and other special clothing for workmen," and in line 22, after the words "Library Building," to strike out "\$3,900" and insert "\$5,000," so as to read:

For mail, delivery, and telephone services, uniforms for guards, stationery, miscellaneous supplies, and all other incidental expenses in connection with the custody and maintenance of the Library Building, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 22, to strike out:

For any expense of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the board, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government Printing Office," on page 38, line 6, after the word "character," to strike out "rubber boots, coats, and gloves," so as to read:

Public printing and binding: To provide the Public Printer with a working capital for the following purposes for the execution of printing, binding, lithographing, mapping, engraving, and other authorized work of the Government Printing Office for the various branches of the Government: For salaries of Public Printer, \$10,000, and Deputy Public Printer, \$7,500; for salaries, compensation, or wages of all necessary officers and employees additional to those herein appropriated for, including employees necessary to handle waste paper and condemned material for sale; to enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of law granting holidays and half holidays and Executive orders granting holidays and half holidays with pay to employees; to enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of law granting 30 days' annual leave to employees with pay; rents, fuel, gas, heat, electric current, gas and electric fixtures; bicycles, motor-propelled vehicles for the carriage of printing and printing supplies, and the maintenance, repair, and operation of the same, to be used only for official purposes, including operation, repair, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use of the officers of the Government Printing Office when in writing ordered by the Public Printer; freight, express, telegraph, and telephone service; furniture, typewriters, and carpets; traveling expenses; stationery, postage, and advertising; directories, technical books, newspapers and magazines, and books of reference (not exceeding \$500); adding and numbering machines, time stamps, and other machines of similar character; machinery (not including \$300,000); equipment, and for repairs to machinery, implements, and buildings, and for minor alterations to buildings; necessary equipment, maintenance, and supplies for the emergency room for the use of all employees in the

Government Printing Office who may be taken suddenly ill or receive injury while on duty; other necessary contingent and miscellaneous items authorized by the Public Printer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 5, in the item making appropriation for public printing and binding, to strike out "\$3,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall be immediately available," and to insert "\$2,250,000," so as to read:

Provided, That inks, glues, and other supplies manufactured by the Government Printing Office in connection with its work may be furnished to departments and other establishments of the Government upon requisition, and payment made from appropriations available therefor; for expenses authorized in writing by the Joint Committee on Printing for the inspection of printing and binding equipment, material, and supplies, and Government printing plants in the District of Columbia or elsewhere (not exceeding \$1,000); for salaries and expenses of preparing the semimonthly and session indexes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing (chief indexer at \$3,480, one cataloguer at \$3,180, two cataloguers at \$2,460 each, and one cataloguer at \$2,100); and for all the necessary labor, paper, materials, and equipment needed in the prosecution and delivery and mailing of the work; in all, \$2,250,000, to which shall be charged the printing and binding authorized to be done for Congress, the printing and binding for use of the Government Printing Office, and printing and binding (not exceeding \$2,000) for official use of the Architect of the Capitol when authorized by the Secretary of the Senate; in all to an amount not exceeding this sum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 7, to strike out:

The Public Printer may continue the employment under his jurisdiction of Samuel Robinson, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD messenger, notwithstanding the provisions of any act prohibiting his employment because of age.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Superintendent of Documents," on page 42, line 8, after the word "bibliographies," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$89,200," so as to read:

For furniture and fixtures, typewriters, carpets, labor-saving machines and accessories, time stamps, adding and numbering machines, awnings, curtains, books of reference; directories, books, miscellaneous office and desk supplies, paper, twine, glue, envelopes, postage, car fares, soap, towels, disinfectants, and ice; drayage, express, freight, telephone and telegraph service; traveling expenses (not to exceed \$200); repairs to buildings, elevators, and machinery; preserving sanitary condition of building; light, heat, and power; stationery and office printing, including blanks, price lists, and bibliographies, \$89,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 9, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$39,000" and insert "\$34,800," so as to read:

For catalogues and indexes, not exceeding \$34,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 10, after the word "libraries," to strike out "\$85,000; in all, \$224,000," and insert "\$76,000; in all, \$200,000," so as to read:

for supplying books to depository libraries, \$76,000; in all \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Part II—Title I—Compensation reduction of Federal employees, compensation defined," on page 44, line 15, after the word "allowance," to strike out "(except allowances for subsistence, quarters, heat, light, and travel)," and in line 19, after the word "enlistment," to strike out "and includes the retired pay of judges," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 101. As used in this title, the term "compensation" means any salary, pay wage, allowance, or other emolument paid for services rendered in any civilian or noncivilian office, position, employment, or enlistment; and the retired pay of all commissioned, warrant, enlisted, and other personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Lighthouse Service, and the Public Health Service; but does not include payments out of any retirement, disability, or relief fund made up wholly or in part of contributions of employees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Schedule of Temporary Reductions," on page 45, line 6, after the word "reduced," to strike out "as follows: Compensation at an

annual rate of \$2,500 or less shall be exempt from reduction; and compensation at an annual rate in excess of \$2,500 shall be reduced by 11 per cent of the amount thereof in excess of \$2,500" and insert "by 10 per cent of the amount thereof," so as to read:

Sec. 102. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, the compensation for each civilian and noncivilian office, position, employment, or enlistment in any branch or service of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia is hereby reduced by 10 per cent of the amount thereof.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this is one of the vital points in the second part of the bill. I want to say that our committee gave this matter study for days and days. It is a very difficult matter to deal with. We had different ideas as to what should be done in regard to economies as relating to Government employees. Some contended that no cut should be made at all. Others contended for a different method of procedure. Some of us would have liked to begin at a certain rate of pay and apply the reduction in salaries above that rate.

It was a very difficult matter. There are objections, of course, made to every suggestion. It looks to be a little hard on Government employees and Government clerks, who are not overpaid in any event, to further reduce their salaries during these times. But we all appreciate the situation. We all appreciate what has been done in private business generally. Reductions have been made, sometimes twice, and in some cases more than twice. I think there is a pretty general feeling throughout the country that the Government employees should bear some part of the reduction.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator has mentioned the fact that, while there is a uniform reduction of 10 per cent, it applies solely and alone to the fiscal year 1933 and at the end of that year the former salaries automatically come into force and effect again.

Mr. JONES. That is correct. I was just going to say that when we finally came to the conclusion that it might be the wisest course to pursue, we decided to make it apply only to one year, hoping, of course, that before that year is over conditions will get better.

I want to say that I felt that there ought to be some difference made between what we term the higher paid clerks and the lower paid clerks. It seemed to me that those who are getting \$3,000 a year and under might be fixed at a certain rate of reduction, while those who are getting over \$3,000 a year, including ourselves, ought to bear a heavier reduction.

There are many inequities, however, with reference to reductions, especially with reference to the point of division. I felt that we might be perfectly willing to have a cut of 20 per cent in our own salaries. It costs just as much for the average man, no matter what his position may be, to get his food and to get reasonably good clothing and the absolutely necessary things that one has to have, as it costs the higher-paid man. In other words, expenses of that nature are substantially the same to both classes of men.

There are many things in the way of determining just how this reduction should be handled. After we had canvassed the situation carefully, we felt that the fairest way, the most equitable way, was to put everybody on the same basis—the low-salaried man to get the same rate of reduction as the high-salaried man, 10 per cent from the bottom to the top and from the top to the bottom. We came to the conclusion that that was the most equitable, the fairest, and the most just way to fix the compensation so that every employee of the National Government should be affected proportionately alike. As I said, there are inequities in it, but there are inequities in any other method of procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the amount of economy which it is assumed will be accomplished under section 102?

Mr. JONES. We finally came to the conclusion that the private soldier, the private sailor—

Mr. JOHNSON. I am not speaking of exceptions.

Mr. JONES. I understand, but after taking them out then the 10 per cent reduction would amount to \$121,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Can the Senator tell me what will be the amount presumably saved by taking 10 per cent of salaries of \$2,500 and less?

Mr. JONES. If we should exempt salaries of \$2,500 and less, we would save about \$9,000,000 as against \$121,000,000. I have a table showing the general savings. On all salaries by a reduction of 10 per cent we would save \$133,900,000. On salaries of \$1,999 and under there would be a saving of \$28,100,000, and on salaries over \$2,000 there would be a saving of \$75,000,000, or \$103,000,000 all together. On salaries from \$1,999 to \$2,999 there would be a saving of \$57,500,000, and on salaries above \$3,000 there would be a saving of \$18,100,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is \$59,000,000, or about three times as much as on salaries above would be saved by the 10 per cent economy plan by taxing the salaries of \$3,000 and less?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. JONES. That is the estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON. In reality, in the economies that are accomplished, the greatest accomplishment is in the cutting of low salaries?

Mr. JONES. Yes; because there are so many of those employees. If we fixed it at from \$1,000 up to \$4,999, that would be a saving of \$56,700,000. Above \$5,000 it would only be \$4,600,000 because of the small number that would be affected. Adding the two together would give \$61,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Was it the consensus of opinion of the committee that the cutting of small salaries would be conducive to prosperity?

Mr. JONES. We did not consider especially that phase of the matter, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON. That did not enter into the consideration?

Mr. JONES. We were directed to investigate matters of economy and to save some money for the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill. It has only come to me at noontime to-day. Perhaps others have had it before.

Mr. JONES. I do not think others did have it. We did not get the bill to the printer until 12 or 1 o'clock last night.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to indulge just this observation to the Senator from Washington, that it seems to me it will be about as conducive to prosperity and happiness in this land to cut the small salaries in the fashion that has been done, of those who have little, as it would be conducive to the health of a human being to let all the blood from his body.

Mr. JONES. I hardly think that is a correct comparison.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Washington would take a recess and give us some time to look into this measure? We will make more progress in that way than we will by stumbling along and trying to familiarize ourselves with it, because no one has had an opportunity to examine the bill except those who are members of the committee.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, right in line with the suggestion made by the Senator from Idaho, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I would appeal to the Senator from Washington to have this matter referred back to the committee for an hour at least, so that we could give a little more consideration than has been given to the 10 per cent cut.

I should like to point out that of the \$121,050,000 economy effected by the 10 per cent cut, those employees of the Government who are drawing salaries of \$500 a year or less will contribute to that sum total of economy \$25,457,000.

Those Government employees who are drawing salaries between \$500 and \$1,000 per year will contribute to the economy program \$34,409,000.

Those employees drawing salaries between \$1,000 and \$1,500 will contribute to the economy program \$25,493,000.

Those employees drawing salaries between \$1,500 and \$2,000 will contribute to the economy program \$19,036,000.

So that all Government employees drawing salaries under \$2,000 a year will contribute, in the matter of savings, \$104,395,000 of the total of \$121,000,000 economy that is effected by the bill.

Mr. JONES. May I ask the Senator where his figures come from? I have seen no such figures.

Mr. NYE. I obtained these figures from a table in the House report on the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES. Who furnished those figures?

Mr. NYE. I do not know. I find them in the report which accompanied the bill as it passed the House. At the top of page 4 is a table showing the amount of exemptions that would prevail as I have stated them.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. The figures which the Senator from North Dakota has just given illustrate very vividly the actual situation which confronted the Economy Committee. According to the figures just read by the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield, the Senator from North Dakota wants to make a correction of the figures which he just read from the table to which he referred.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Iowa has called to my attention the fact, which I had not previously observed, that in the House report the table showing the exemptions of \$500, \$1,000, \$1,500, and \$2,000 is based on the proposition of exempting from all salaries first \$500, and in the next instance \$1,000; so that my compilation would not be as correct as I had thought it was. However, so large a part of this burden is borne by those drawing the smaller salaries that I think we ought to reconsider the matter in committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now, Mr. President, if I may go on—

Mr. JONES. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. What the Senator from North Dakota said is quite true, that the figures on which he based his statement were the House estimate of what would happen if we exempted \$500 from each salary, or \$1,000 from each salary, or \$1,500 from each salary, which of course would cut out all those receiving \$1,500. The number of persons receiving \$500 a year is infinitesimal. The amount mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota means what would happen if we exempted that amount from any reduction. The truth is that there are such a tremendous number of Government employees receiving small salaries that if we exempt them, we find ourselves in the position of being unable to effect any real large amount of saving. By exempting, for instance, as the Senator has said, the first \$2,000, we would lose from the bill over \$100,000,000.

The committee felt that a person who received a salary of \$1,000 two years ago, and was getting along on that salary, and who, under this bill, would receive only \$900, could buy just as much if not more to-day, due to the increased purchasing power of the dollar, as he could two years ago with the larger amount of salary.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question there? Pardon me; I did not want to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I say just one more thing? The committee also felt that if there was any justice in the salary rates as determined upon by the Congress in return for work done in relation to the job performed and the amount paid in the outside world, it was the fairest thing that could be done, in addition to being the one which would yield the

greatest amount of economy; and I may say that I should be glad to be shown any other way in which we could save \$100,000,000 than by doing this. In view of the fact that it saves such a large amount, and that it bears equally on all salaries in accordance with the laws passed by Congress, it did seem the fairest thing to do.

I may say, parenthetically, that the committee went through the salaries paid in the Government service; and wherever they saw a head, so to speak, hit at it. In other words, all salaries over \$10,000 that could be reduced under the Constitution were reduced to \$10,000, and a further cut was taken on that.

I have in mind a lawyer serving on one of the commissions—I think it may be the Shipping Board—who receives now \$18,000, whose salary will be cut from \$18,000 to \$10,000, and then he will get a still further cut of 10 per cent; so that his salary will be cut in two, from \$18,000 to \$9,000.

Another case with which many people are familiar is the case of General Hines, the very able Administrator of the Veterans' Bureau, who to-day, under the law, receives a salary of \$12,000. Under this bill he loses the difference between \$12,000 and \$10,000, or \$2,000, and then he gets a cut of 10 per cent on his \$10,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. A temporary cut?

Mr. BINGHAM. A temporary cut, for one year; which brings him down to \$9,000 from the present \$12,000 that he is receiving.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask these questions because the opportunity has not been mine thus far to investigate, and only now the bill comes before us. I think it is a most unfortunate thing that it comes without the ability on the part of any of us save the committee—and they have guarded their work, I think, very carefully—to know exactly what is in the bill; but, as I understood the Senator, out of the amount that is saved, as it is termed, under this bill, more than \$100,000,000 will come from salaries of \$2,000 and less. Is that correct?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President; that is not quite correct. As the Senator from North Dakota first gave the figures, that would be true.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I am not speaking of his figures. I am speaking of what are the actual figures.

Mr. BINGHAM. The way that the House proposed was what seemed to them a fair method of exempting the first \$2,500; in other words, that the person who received a salary of \$3,000 would not be reduced 10 per cent or 11 per cent on \$3,000, but only the difference between \$3,000 and \$2,500.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right. Now, your bill makes it a straight 10 per cent?

Mr. BINGHAM. By exempting the first \$2,000 we lose about \$104,000,000 from the economy program.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am speaking of your bill. How much do you get on salaries of \$2,000 and less? What do you make out of that?

Mr. JONES. We make \$16,665,000; or, rather, that is what we would lose with the exemption of \$2,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then I assume that that is the economy you would make in a 10 per cent cut on salaries of \$2,000 or less.

Mr. JONES. That is not correct, I know.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. If an exemption of \$2,000 were placed in the law, the amount of revenue that would be realized would be \$16,665,000, and that is what the chairman has given the Senator. I do not think that answers his question, however.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; that is not what I am seeking to obtain.

Mr. BYRNES. I do not know that there are any figures in the report which would give the Senator exactly that information.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Senator ask his question again? I think I have the figures before me now.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right. First, I want to ascertain how much is the economy effected by taking 10 per cent of salaries of \$2,000 and less.

Mr. BINGHAM. The saving, if the plan called in the House report plan No. 2 is adopted, under which salaries of \$2,000 and over were subjected to a reduction of 10 per cent, is \$75,100,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, do I understand that \$75,000,000 represents the amount that will be saved to the Government by deducting 10 per cent from salaries of \$2,000 and less?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am trying to get at that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, who has the floor? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Could not that be accomplished by subtracting the \$16,665,000 from the \$121,000,000, so that we get \$104,335,000 that comes out of the employees with salaries of \$2,000 or under?

Mr. JOHNSON. All right. Then, we get \$104,000,000 out of employees who are paid \$2,000 or less?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, Mr. President. The Senator is quite incorrect in that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am trying to inquire; that is all. It shows the confusion that exists.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the Senator will be patient with me for a moment, I have given him the figure of what the saving would be if 10 per cent were levied on salaries of \$2,000 and over, namely, \$75,000,000. The difference between \$75,000,000 and the \$121,000,000, which is \$46,000,000, is the amount paid on salaries of \$2,000 and under.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right. Now, if the Senator will be patient with me, we will take that figure, then, that we derive from salaries of \$2,000 and less—\$46,000,000, in round numbers.

Now, let us jump the figure to \$3,000. On salaries of \$3,000 and less, what is the amount that will accrue to the United States Government by cutting them 10 per cent?

Mr. BINGHAM. If we were to deduct 10 per cent on salaries of \$3,000 and over, the saving would be \$18,100,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would you go through the same process of deducting the \$18,000,000, then, from the sum total?

Mr. BINGHAM. Deducting that from \$121,000,000, we get \$103,000,000, which is the saving on the great number of salaries that are \$3,000 and under.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right. We are getting, then, at our figures. We save, then, \$103,000,000 by taking 10 per cent off salaries of \$3,000 and less. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. BINGHAM. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought the committee would know. Excuse me.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator asked his question in such a way that I was not certain. Will the Senator please repeat his question?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. According to the computations that have just been stated, we receive for the United States Government \$103,000,000, in round numbers, by taking 10 per cent off salaries of \$3,000 and less.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much is the total saving in this economy bill—I mean, in the entire economy bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. The total saving is \$231,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Two hundred and thirty-one million dollars. So that practically—not exactly at all, but for the purpose of using round numbers—we are taking one-half of the economies for this Government, in this stress, off of people who receive salaries of \$3,000 and less.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator look at this matter in another way? The way he has presented it appeals to all of us, and appealed to me. Here is the other aspect of the situation:

The total bill of the United States Government for the pending year is something over \$4,000,000,000. Of that amount about one-fourth, or \$1,000,000,000, is for payment to veterans, pensions, compensation, disability allowances, and so forth. About one-third is salaries, the actual amount

of salaries being \$1,339,000,000. Of the balance, about \$640,000,000 is interest on the public debt; about \$350,000,000 is for public works, and the balance, which roughly is somewhere around seven or eight hundred million dollars, is for general expenses. That is a little too large, because there should be deducted from that personal services. But will the Senator tell us where we are going to make a saving when we are honestly seeking for a saving of somewhere around \$250,000,000, when \$1,339,000,000 goes for salaries, of which by far the larger part goes in small salaries to little people, and we can not save on the public debt, and the savings on veterans which the committee has adopted and recommended are less than \$50,000,000? Where will the Senator suggest that we save it?

The committee, I may say to him, after three weeks of hard work, day and night, receiving and considering suggestions for economy from all sources within the Government and out of it, did not succeed in finding any great amount of saving except in the pay of employees.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not wish the Senator from Connecticut or any other member of the committee to think that I am critical of their work. That is not the point. I do not know, I say to him with frankness, because I have not studied the problem as he has studied it, where economies will come from; but there is something that is so repugnant to me at this time in taking from the charwomen who work in this Capitol and about this town, and from those who have salaries of \$1,000, \$1,500, \$2,000, and \$3,000 the money that we ought to save at this particular period that I will go any length with the Senator or with my fellows here in taking from any departments or in any other fashion that may be accorded us, if there be such, what is necessary to effect the economies desired.

I want to get away, if I can, from taking this money, the amount we have taken, at least, from those who have little and those who are supporting themselves, supporting, perhaps, members of their families, living God knows how in these times; taking from them half of the money the Government says by an economy bill it must save under these circumstances.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, one-half of our expense goes to the veterans. Would the Senator care to vote to take 10 per cent of all the money to be given to the veterans?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would not take 10 per cent as a yard measure in any case. If I had the ability, and the time, and the opportunity, and the knowledge I would go through all the items of the particular bureau and see whether or not anything could be taken legitimately from the bureau.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what the committee has done.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not question that; but the Senator must remember, let me say to him again, that the Senate has not had an opportunity to investigate, and my queries have been for the purpose of eliciting information wholly. We have had no opportunity to see the measure, to know what the committee has done. We recognize the ability, the perspicacity, the perspicuity, the shrewdness, and all of those attributes which go with a United States Senator on this committee, and we know that the committee did its utmost. Do not, I beg you, think I am critical of it in the slightest degree. I am asking for information, and to see whether it is not possible that there may be some other way of effecting economies in this Government besides taking from those who have not anything to-day, and who, God knows, have difficulty enough in living in these times.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington be good enough to make a brief statement as to why the furlough plan was discarded in favor of the straight salary cut?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, some of us were in favor of the furlough plan, and we considered it, but the general sentiment in the committee seemed to be that it would be extremely difficult to carry out such a plan. Take the rural carriers and the free-delivery carriers, for instance. It would be almost impossible to apply the furlough plan to them. So, after considering all the difficulties, as I said a while ago, and especially things like that, where we could

not possibly arrange with the employees to give them a definite furlough without disarranging the entire service, we were forced to come around practically to the straight cut.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] was very much inclined to favor the furlough plan, but I think he saw the difficulties and recognized them, and felt that we had to give that up and take up this other system.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think the questions asked by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] are important in considering the policy which the Senate and the House are to adopt concerning this effort at economy.

I am not at all sure that I have taken the right method to ascertain what part of the cut in salaries is to fall on the various salary groups. I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Washington, and if I have not taken the right method of arriving at a general basis of approximate calculation I wish he would correct me.

As I understand it, the committee reports that if a 10 per cent salary reduction is applied to all salaries there will be a saving of approximately \$121,000,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is, taking out the enlisted personnel.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not want to confuse it with that. What the committee reports—and what we are talking about—is the 10 per cent reduction in all salaries, as the committee has reported it.

In the House report, on page 4, there is a table entitled "Savings Under Various Percentages and Exemptions." Various percentages from 5 to 15 per cent are tabulated, and then, under the title "Exemption," there is a column of \$500, \$1,000, \$1,500, and \$2,000.

As I understand that table, what it purports to show is that if a 10 per cent reduction on salaries of \$2,000 and above is made, there will be a saving to the Government, as the result of that reduction, of \$16,665,000.

It seems to me that the way to find out how much of this reduction is coming from the group receiving \$2,000 or less is to take the total amount of savings reported by the committee, with the flat 10 per cent reduction on all salaries, and from that to subtract the savings which would be achieved if there were an exemption of \$2,000 and below.

Therefore, is it not correct to say that the group receiving \$2,000 and less will contribute to this \$121,000,000 of savings the amount of \$104,400,000, which is arrived at by subtracting from the total savings reported by the committee on a 10 per cent reduction basis, without exemption, the savings which would be achieved if there were an exemption of \$2,000 and below in the bill, namely, \$16,665,000?

Mr. BINGHAM. The trouble with the Senator's arithmetic, and the table which he is using, is that it contemplates exempting \$2,000 from the Senator's own salary, and all salaries, not charging any reduction whatever on the first \$2,000 of anybody's salary. It is not simply exempting salaries of \$2,000; it is an exemption of \$2,000 on all salaries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator is correct about that, of course, I am wrong in my method. I assumed that this table was drawn up to show the effect of placing the various exemptions in the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true; but the exemption applies to all salaries. If it is \$2,000, it exempts entirely the \$2,000 salary, and all except \$5 on the \$2,005 salary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator refer me to any information contained either in the House or the Senate committee report which shows the effect of starting the reduction at a certain salary, not taking any of that salary, but taking 10 per cent on those above?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what I tried to do; and if the Senator will turn to page 2 he will see plan 2, for instance, which proposes to place a 10 per cent cut on salaries of \$2,000 and over, which is estimated to raise \$75,000,000.

If the Senator will deduct that from the \$133,000,000 at the head of that column, which is what would be saved by placing a 10 per cent cut on all salaries, he will see that the difference between the two is the amount chargeable to salaries under \$2,000. But since the committee exempted all

enlisted personnel, it is necessary to take the figure \$121,000,000 instead of the figure \$133,000,000, as given at the head of that column.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for making that perfectly clear.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are taking a very difficult way to find the results of a very simple calculation. I have seen published time after time a statement of the aggregate salaries of those receiving \$500, \$1,000, \$1,500, and \$2,000, and so on. If we had that table, any of us could tell exactly how much the 10 per cent would amount to on any group, and I know I have seen that table published. It probably has been placed in the RECORD. I simply desire to ask whether the committee had taken that into consideration.

Mr. BINGHAM. That table is in the RECORD.

Mr. LOGAN. If that table is in the RECORD, why should we have any confusion about the reduction of the salaries below \$2,000?

Mr. BINGHAM. The confusion arises from the fact that the House committee proposed two different plans, one that of exempting a certain number of salaries, namely, all those drawing \$1,000 and under, and other plan was exempting \$1,000 or \$2,000 or more from all salaries, as stated on page 4.

Mr. LOGAN. This table is not what I am talking about. A table has been published, which has appeared many times in the newspapers, I suppose prepared by the Civil Service Commission, showing the aggregate salaries of those being paid \$1,000, so many millions, the aggregate paid those getting \$1,500, so many millions, and so on. If we had that table, we would know exactly how much we would take from each group if we should adopt this particular plan.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator will look on page 2, he will see, by multiplying by 10, that in plan 1, where all salaries are cut 10 per cent, the saving is estimated to be \$133,990,000. Hence the total amount paid for all salaries is \$1,399,000,000.

Mr. LOGAN. That still does not show the aggregate salaries as to the different groups at all. That shows the aggregate of the total salaries, but it does not show it as to the different groups. If we had that information, we would not be confused about how much the reduction would amount to on the salaries below \$2,000.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I simply want to state that the clerk of the committee has asked for a mathematical answer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky, and I think he will have that information in a few moments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. How much money is carried in the entire list of appropriation bills for repair work, extensions, and new construction? Approximately how much money is covered by those three items in all the bills?

Mr. JONES. About \$300,000,000, the Secretary says. I do not know myself. He has kept track of that closely, and he says about \$300,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The second question is this: Does not the Senator think that Congress will provide some plan of unemployment relief in the way of public-works construction?

Mr. JONES. The Senator knows just as much about that as I do. There is considerable talk about it, and, as I understand, that is really on the program we expect to complete before the session is over. Personally, I think we should do something along those lines.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Here is a suggestion I want to make to the committee and to the Senate.

Personally, I am very much opposed to reducing these lower salaries. Government workers who are getting, say, \$1,800 and less, or even \$2,000 and less, have their budgets so made that every dollar of their salaries is allocated in advance. Many of them are making payments upon homes, and if their salaries are cut I can foresee serious consequences to great numbers of them. Personally, I am not in favor of reducing the salaries of the poorer-paid employees.

If some plan could be devised whereby the poorer-paid employees would not have their salaries cut, whereby the salary cuts could start at salaries of \$1,800 or \$2,000 or \$2,400 or \$2,500, to be decided upon, and then the salaries above that cut on a graduated scale, cutting the first bracket, say, \$500, or a certain percentage, and as the salary increased increasing the cut, that to me would sound reasonable.

We should go through the bills and eliminate from the bills the items for repairs, extensions, and new construction, lift them out bodily, and set them over into the unemployment-relief program, and finance that part of the expenditure by a bond issue. Proceeding in that way we could solve the present situation by postponing the new construction and repairs and extensions over a period of years. There is no occasion now for raising taxes to pay for construction that is to be used in the years to come. It occurs to me that if some such simple program could be decided upon we could well protect the great bulk of the Government workers and they would not be injured. Those receiving the higher salaries can stand a cut. We could make eliminations. The committee could take the War Department bill, for instance, and eliminate such items as river and harbor improvements, lift those out of the bill and put them into the unemployment-relief program, and finance them by a bond issue over a period of years.

It occurs to me that that is the way to solve this matter so as to avoid doing anybody substantial injustice, and, at the same time, transacting the business as it should be handled.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington how long he expects to continue the session to-night. Is there any well-defined plan about the hours that are going to be devoted to legislation?

Mr. JONES. I wanted to proceed until about half past 5 if possible.

Mr. NORRIS. I am trying to find out whether those in charge of the proceedings here are going to crowd these bills through with the idea of adjourning before the national conventions.

Mr. JONES. The Senator need not ask me that question, although I do not hesitate to say I do not think there is any possibility of it. I do not think we ought to try to do it. I think that we ought to accord proper consideration to the measures before the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very glad to hear the Senator express himself in that way.

Mr. JONES. However, that is only my personal view.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I extract some information from the chairman of the committee?

Mr. NORRIS. I will try to extract some from the Senator from New Hampshire. What does he say about the program? Are we going to try to adjourn before the conventions?

Mr. MOSES. I do not know about the program, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Can not the Senator give me any information?

Mr. MOSES. I do know that there are some things in this bill which have not been attended to, and I myself want to offer two amendments, one of which means a very considerable amount of revenue to the Government, and the other corrects a most glaring oversight. If this bill is going to be jammed down our throats this afternoon, I want to know it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope, Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I hope Senators will remember that I have the floor; I have not yielded it; I am not half through.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one further observation?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. The quarrel effect is excellent, but it is impossible to understand any Senator so long as so many are talking at once.

Mr. NORRIS. That is a good point, but it has been a daily occurrence.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I will try to enlighten the Senator so far as I may. I have these two amendments; I should like to have them printed so that the Senate may know what they are and may give some thought to them, and I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if time is going to be permitted for that sort of method of dealing with this bill?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I do not think the Senator from Washington has ever tried to cram any bill down any Senator's throat and he does not expect to do so in this instance. All I expect to do is to progress as rapidly as we possibly can with the bill. If we can not get through with it to-day, using proper methods and going along in a proper way, of course, the bill will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. MOSES. Then if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me I will offer these amendments, to be printed and lie on the table, and I serve notice on the Senator from Washington that the bill will not be passed to-day, because I intend to have these amendments known to the Senate and discussed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it is the purpose of anyone to try to force this bill through to-day.

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to learn that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope it will not be done, and I am quite sure it will not be.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to find out, if I could, whether we were going to keep going here with the idea of adjourning on account of the national conventions. There is a great deal of talk about it, and if that is going to be attempted, I wanted to interpose my objection and my weak voice to try to prevent it.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I take the daring liberty of asking the eminent Senator from Nebraska what interest he has in a Republican national convention? [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we have all read with a great deal of delight in the newspapers of the Senator's interest in the Democratic convention, but I will venture the assertion that, when the Democratic convention shall have concluded its deliberations, the Senator from Illinois will not have any more interest in a Democratic convention than I have now in a Republican convention. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what it seems to me we ought to do is to get out of our minds that we are going to hurry through these appropriation bills and particularly the pending one. We have now reached in this bill the economy plan, and probably the most important of all its features is the amendment that is now pending. We ought to decide with deliberation the question involved. We are not in condition really to deliberate, as everybody knows. Furthermore, this bill—and our attention has been called to the fact by other Senators—has not been before us until to-day, and then after 12 o'clock. We have had no opportunity to read it, and the committee—and I say it without criticism of the committee, because I understand they pursued the course as a matter of self-preservation—could not tell anybody what they were doing or what they were going to bring out. I understand they were afraid to do that; they were afraid that they might not be able to bring anything out if they ever told anybody anything they were going to bring out.

Mr. JONES. That is about right.

Mr. NORRIS. So I say that without criticism. Now, we are confronted with the proposition as to where we are going to make the most important reduction of all. We are faced with it without any opportunity of considering it or comparing it with any other proposition that has ever been laid before us or that any of us has thought about; and we approach it after a strenuous effort during 15 days, working almost day and night, to pass the tax bill and balance the Budget. So it seems to me we ought to hesitate a little bit; we ought to follow the suggestion that has been made;

we ought to adjourn and let Senators have an opportunity to examine this bill and to study this most important question of all. We would all be in a little better state of mind to take it up in a deliberate and logical way if we would go home and go to bed.

Mr. JONES. I think the Senator is right, and if the Senator from Oregon is ready to move an executive session, I shall not object.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I have about concluded, but I want Senators again to observe that I still have the floor. So do not let them ask the Senator from Washington whether or not they can get it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I send to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending bill, the amendment being, on page 56, in line 24, to strike out the words "for night work." I ask that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. If I may have the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I should like to say, in response to the question he asked as to the amount of saving which would be effected by the proposed reduction in salaries of less than \$2,000, that the clerk of the committee,

making the computation with the Director of the Bureau of Efficiency, states that the amount is \$43,300,000. Mr. Rea has handed me those figures.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield, but I hope the Senate will be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. As I understood the Senator from South Carolina, the Bureau of Efficiency and the clerk of the Appropriations Committee have estimated the sum mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina as relating to salaries of \$2,000 and under?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; that is what the clerk says.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I only have a word or two to say, and then I will conclude.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. A little earlier in the afternoon the Senator from Kentucky asked for a table which would state the annual rate of pay of Government employees, how many there were in each group, and cumulative cost of each group. These figures are in the Record of February 8, but since that is not before us, I ask that they may be printed in the Record in connection with this debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Number and cost of salaries of (a) civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government, and (b) military personnel
[Compiled in January, 1932, from latest available information]

Annual rate of pay ¹		Both civil and military				Civil				Military ²			
Not less than	But less than	Number ³		Salary cost ⁴		Number ³		Salary cost ⁴		Number ³		Salary cost ⁴	
		Number in group	Cumulative total	Cost for group	Cumulative cost ⁴	Number in group	Cumulative total	Cost for group	Cumulative cost ⁴	Number in group	Cumulative total	Cost for group	Cumulative cost ⁴
(a)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
\$0.00	\$1,000.00	345,351	1,023,373	\$154,846,967.25	\$1,315,690,467.12	124,678	732,460	\$43,309,021.57	\$1,055,970,636.55	220,673	290,913	\$111,537,945.68	\$259,719,830.87
1,000.00	1,100.00	59,234	678,022	20,468,073.28	1,360,843,499.87	56,883	607,782	18,038,396.80	1,012,661,614.98	2,351	70,240	2,429,676.48	148,181,884.89
1,100.00	1,200.00	26,528	618,788	28,883,355.40	1,440,375,426.59	12,157	550,899	12,319,482.44	994,623,218.18	14,371	67,889	16,563,872.96	145,752,208.41
1,200.00	1,300.00	44,909	592,260	41,292,696.34	1,511,492,071.19	37,558	538,742	32,243,740.84	982,303,735.74	7,351	53,518	9,048,955.50	129,188,335.45
1,300.00	1,400.00	21,140	547,351	22,865,154.58	1,570,199,374.85	20,243	501,184	21,647,211.78	950,059,994.90	897	46,167	1,217,942.80	120,139,379.95
1,400.00	1,500.00	27,762	526,211	32,708,889.97	1,647,334,220.27	24,643	480,941	28,273,105.49	928,412,783.12	3,119	45,270	4,435,784.48	118,021,437.15
1,500.00	1,600.00	27,895	498,449	38,442,723.88	1,614,625,330.30	24,044	456,298	32,562,908.76	900,139,677.63	3,551	42,151	5,879,725.12	114,485,652.67
1,600.00	1,700.00	31,446	470,554	48,214,483.66	1,676,182,606.42	28,389	432,254	43,120,969.84	867,576,678.87	3,057	38,800	5,093,513.72	108,605,927.55
1,700.00	1,800.00	21,942	439,108	36,028,965.82	1,697,968,122.86	20,028	403,865	32,712,739.90	824,455,709.03	1,914	35,243	3,316,225.92	103,512,413.83
1,800.00	1,900.00	42,684	417,166	75,502,724.17	1,891,959,157.04	35,690	383,837	62,612,587.73	791,742,969.13	6,994	33,329	12,890,136.44	100,196,187.91
1,900.00	2,000.00	33,001	374,482	60,502,418.78	1,925,461,575.82	32,776	348,147	60,060,268.58	729,130,381.40	2,225	28,335	4,442,150.20	87,306,051.47
2,000.00	2,100.00	25,267	341,481	60,711,574.31	1,986,173,150.13	24,186	315,371	48,580,825.91	669,070,112.82	1,081	26,110	2,180,748.40	86,863,901.27
2,100.00	2,200.00	118,759	316,214	247,086,923.94	2,233,222,439.78	116,759	291,185	242,864,839.74	620,539,286.01	2,000	25,029	4,222,064.20	84,683,152.87
2,200.00	2,300.00	16,384	197,455	36,211,572.64	2,269,433,982.42	13,078	174,426	28,858,487.00	377,674,447.17	3,306	23,029	7,353,085.64	80,461,068.67
2,300.00	2,400.00	181,071	59,586,469.82	421,923,943.20	2,311,357,926.24	25,374	161,348	57,547,533.82	348,815,960.17	894	19,723	2,038,936.00	73,107,088.03
2,400.00	2,500.00	23,293	154,803	56,367,461.98	2,367,725,388.22	23,225	135,974	56,202,844.98	291,268,426.35	68	18,829	164,617.00	71,069,047.03
2,500.00	2,600.00	49,291	131,610	23,113,918.52	2,400,839,306.74	49,138	112,749	22,726,480.52	235,065,581.37	153	18,761	387,438.00	70,504,430.03
2,600.00	2,700.00	15,567	82,219	40,475,668.19	2,441,314,974.93	15,116	63,611	39,285,454.19	212,339,100.85	451	18,608	1,190,184.00	70,516,992.03
2,700.00	2,800.00	8,177	66,652	22,135,718.00	2,463,450,692.93	6,493	48,495	17,498,195.00	173,053,616.66	1,684	18,157	4,637,523.00	69,326,808.03
2,800.00	2,900.00	9,425	58,475	26,671,541.10	2,472,922,234.03	5,047	42,002	14,067,523.30	155,555,421.66	4,378	16,473	12,604,017.80	64,689,285.03
2,900.00	3,000.00	4,263	49,050	12,082,169.00	2,477,184,403.03	3,984	36,955	11,295,440.00	141,487,898.36	279	12,095	816,729.00	52,085,267.23
3,000.00	3,100.00	4,191	44,787	12,374,759.22	2,481,659,162.25	3,612	32,971	10,331,218.00	130,222,458.36	679	11,816	2,043,541.22	51,268,538.23
3,100.00	3,200.00	2,011	40,596	6,110,810.44	2,487,769,972.69	1,803	29,459	5,459,319.44	119,891,240.36	203	11,137	651,491.00	49,224,997.01
3,200.00	3,300.00	4,613	38,586	14,754,776.00	2,492,524,748.69	4,484	27,656	14,335,643.00	114,431,920.92	129	10,929	419,133.00	48,573,506.01
3,300.00	3,400.00	2,749	33,972	9,060,766.00	2,496,585,514.69	2,343	23,172	7,692,167.00	100,096,277.92	405	10,800	1,368,599.00	48,154,373.01
3,400.00	3,500.00	2,019	31,223	6,870,907.71	2,500,456,422.40	1,825	20,829	6,199,120.15	92,404,110.92	194	10,934	671,787.56	46,785,774.01
3,500.00	3,600.00	2,105	29,204	7,334,056.25	2,502,790,478.65	1,987	19,004	6,916,494.00	86,204,990.77	118	10,290	418,162.25	46,113,086.45
3,600.00	3,700.00	3,196	27,099	11,468,161.53	2,504,958,640.18	1,358	17,017	4,841,023.53	79,288,496.77	1,838	10,082	6,627,138.00	45,695,824.20
3,700.00	3,800.00	1,602	23,903	5,849,502.00	2,506,808,142.18	939	15,659	3,362,002.00	74,447,473.24	666	8,244	2,497,600.00	39,088,686.20
3,800.00	3,900.00	2,954	22,301	11,166,973.04	2,508,975,115.22	2,876	14,723	10,864,987.00	71,095,471.24	79	7,578	300,986.04	36,571,186.20
3,900.00	4,000.00	1,489	19,347	5,810,413.12	2,510,785,528.34	251	11,848	976,592.00	60,230,484.24	1,238	7,499	4,833,851.12	36,270,200.16
4,000.00	4,100.00	2,871	17,858	9,552,631.96	2,512,738,160.30	1,678	11,597	6,341,012.40	59,253,922.24	793	6,261	3,211,619.56	31,436,349.04
4,100.00	4,200.00	154	15,487	631,380.04	2,513,889,540.34	153	10,019	627,204.04	52,912,909.84	1	5,468	4,176.00	28,224,729.48
4,200.00	4,300.00	1,535	15,333	6,454,630.98	2,515,444,171.32	872	9,966	3,613,827.50	52,285,706.80	663	5,467	2,840,803.48	28,220,553.48
4,300.00	4,400.00	1,714	13,798	7,637,867.50	2,517,082,038.82	722	8,994	3,171,917.50	48,671,878.80	992	4,804	4,465,950.00	25,379,750.00
4,400.00	4,500.00	2,605	12,084	11,937,286.00	2,518,219,324.82	2,250	8,272	10,269,866.00	45,499,960.80	355	3,812	1,677,420.00	20,913,800.00
4,500.00	5,000.00	2,634	9,479	9,812,993.00	2,520,032,317.82	1,256	6,022	6,148,193.00	35,240,094.80	748	3,457	3,664,700.00	19,236,390.00
5,000.00	5,200.00	1,602	7,445	8,039,054.00	2,521,671,371.82	919	4,736	4,573,104.00	29,091,901.80	633	2,709	3,465,930.00	15,571,690.00

¹ The annual rate of pay of civilian employees is the gross rate of pay and includes annual allowances for quarters, subsistence, or other facilities or services furnished by the Government. The annual rate of pay of military personnel is the net rate of pay for both active and retired men. It does not include allowances as distinguished from pay.

² "Military" includes the military personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

³ The "number in group" indicated at each rate of pay includes seasonal and temporary employees.

⁴ The "cost for group" indicated at each rate of pay includes amounts paid to seasonal and temporary employees.

The cumulative totals shown in columns lettered (c), (g), and (k), give the total number of persons receiving pay at an annual rate equal to or higher than the minimum rate indicated in column (a). The cumulative costs shown in columns lettered (e), (i), and (m), give the aggregate annual compensation of employees paid at an annual rate equal to or higher than the minimum rate indicated in column (a).

Number and cost of salaries of (a) civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government, and (b) military personnel—Continued

Annual rate of pay		Both civil and military				Civil				Military			
Not less than	But less than	Number		Salary cost		Number		Salary cost		Number		Salary cost	
		Number in group	Cumulative total	Cost for group	Cumulative cost	Number in group	Cumulative total	Cost for group	Cumulative cost	Number in group	Cumulative total	Cost for group	Cumulative cost
(a)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
\$5,200.00	\$5,400.00	510	5,843	\$2,655,770.60	\$36,624,527.80	374	3,817	\$1,941,870.60	\$24,518,797.80	136	2,025	\$713,900.00	\$12,105,730.00
5,400.00	5,600.00	314	5,333	1,695,752.80	33,968,757.20	311	3,443	1,679,452.80	22,576,927.20	3	1,890	16,300.00	11,391,830.00
5,600.00	5,800.00	1,324	5,019	7,441,850.80	32,273,004.40	905	3,132	5,033,770.80	20,897,474.40	419	1,887	2,408,080.00	11,375,530.00
5,800.00	6,000.00	442	3,695	2,554,689.00	24,831,153.60	303	2,227	1,758,719.00	15,863,703.60	139	1,468	805,950.00	8,967,450.00
6,000.00	6,500.00	1,943	3,253	11,694,775.00	22,296,484.60	698	1,924	4,218,775.00	14,104,984.60	1,245	1,329	7,476,000.00	8,161,500.00
6,500.00	7,000.00	309	1,310	1,997,424.60	10,571,709.60	309	1,226	1,997,424.60	9,886,203.60	84	84	685,500.00	685,500.00
7,000.00	7,500.00	244	1,001	1,710,830.00	8,574,285.00	244	917	1,710,830.00	7,888,785.00	84	84	685,500.00	685,500.00
7,500.00	8,000.00	150	757	1,111,033.00	6,863,455.00	150	673	1,111,033.00	6,177,955.00	84	84	685,500.00	685,500.00
8,000.00	8,500.00	216	607	1,711,672.00	5,752,422.00	133	523	1,047,672.00	5,066,922.00	83	84	664,000.00	685,500.00
8,500.00	9,000.00	40	391	344,500.00	4,040,750.00	40	390	344,500.00	4,019,250.00	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
9,000.00	10,000.00	138	351	1,243,350.00	3,696,350.00	138	350	1,243,250.00	3,674,750.00	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
10,000.00	11,000.00	134	213	1,340,000.00	2,452,900.00	124	212	1,340,000.00	2,431,400.00	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
11,000.00	12,000.00	6	79	66,000.00	1,112,900.00	6	78	66,000.00	1,091,400.00	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
12,000.00	15,000.00	41	73	494,900.00	1,046,900.00	41	72	494,900.00	1,025,400.00	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
15,000.00	Up.	32	32	552,000.00	552,000.00	31	31	530,500.00	530,500.00	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00

NOTE.—This is simply a restatement of the statement released by the Bureau of the Budget Jan. 30, 1932, the only difference being in the arrangement of the cumulative totals. In the statement of Jan. 30, 1932, the cumulative totals commence with the lowest salary rate. In this statement the cumulative totals commence with the highest salary rate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, just a word.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I will wait until the Senator has finished.

Mr. NORRIS. There will be time after I get through, and if Senators will not interrupt me I will be through in a very short time. I want to say just a word more about our work.

I believe, Mr. President, that we ought to proceed in a deliberate way, performing our work in a deliberate, logical way, without reference to any stipulated or imaginary date upon which the Congress is to adjourn. That will mean that we will not be able to finish before the national conventions; but, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing when we reach the time when the Republican National Convention is to be held, if any reasonable number of Senators want to attend the show, that we should take a recess. I will make the same statement as to the Democratic convention. Personally I do not see any reason why we should take a recess on account of the Republican convention, because we have our machinery so well organized, and all the cogs and different parts of it working in such complete harmony, that we know now what the outcome is going to be, that it will be automatic in its operation, and it will not need the attendance of any of the great statesmen who are honoring me with their presence. [Laughter.] Yet, Mr. President, I realize that unforeseen things happen sometimes, and I tell you that I would never forgive myself if I stayed away from that convention and something happened to Mr. Hoover's machine.

On the Democratic side, however, they have a fight, as they usually do [laughter]; they will have to take some time, and we ought to give it to them, because I have no doubt they will put on a show that will be worth seeing. It will take place before the new revenue law shall go into effect, so that there will be no tax on admissions.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that there must be no demonstrations in the galleries. He is not going to announce it again; he means it; if there are any more demonstrations in the galleries, the Chair will order the galleries cleared.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I did not address my eminent friend, the Senator from Nebraska, Brother NORRIS, but, observing that he had adverted to the coming Republican National Convention with something of a mournful attitude, an attitude becoming to one preparing to be a pall-

bearer, and then he turned to me with a gleefulness in his countenance, as if entertaining the thought that only at the Democratic convention would there be hope and refuge. I want to say that I was a little at a loss to discover why, in turning to me, he found in my presence as a proposed candidate the first sad presages of failure and of a possible unsatisfactory result from the Democratic convention. He translated this thought by saying we always fight, therefore there will be disorder and confusion. While I think as to his prophecy, when the proceedings shall have been concluded, there may be revealed some sort of disappointment to some of us equal to that which he will feel as to his own convention, I desire to let my eminent friend know that, as for myself, I will be quite free to say that the perfect candidate for my convention can be seen by me only in the looking-glass. [Laughter.] I really can conceive very little of hardship or of affliction in that selection as could befall us so severely as that crash and crush of the Hoover machine to which our eminent friend from Nebraska intimates. The Senator has kindly intimated something as to aspirations of myself or the hopes of those who venture for a moment to think that I could be an adornment to that convention if I reap no profitable result from its deliberations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Out of order, I desire to offer an amendment, which I will ask to have read, printed, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the proper place in the bill add a new section, to read as follows:

"Sec. 409. The President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend during any part or all of the next fiscal year the operation of independent offices, bureaus, and commissions, and to discontinue personnel, services, costs, expenses, and salaries in any of the executive and independent departments and agencies and offices of the Government. This authority and power is temporarily vested in the President so that he may prevent the expenses of the Government exceeding its income for the next fiscal year."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, recently prepared a statement which I assume has been addressed to all Members of the Senate with reference to the economy bill. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 1, 1932.

Because of the deep interest which the American Federation of Labor takes in the economic welfare of the Government employees, we are deeply concerned over the provisions in the economy bill. For this reason I am taking the liberty of communicating with you to officially advise you of the position of the American Federation of Labor and of labor generally throughout the Nation so far as the American Federation of Labor can speak for it.

It is the opinion of the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor that a reduction in the salaries and wages of the Government employees would be economically wrong. Through such action a great injustice would be imposed upon thousands of Government workers without a corresponding benefit to the Government. Wage cutting on the part of the Government would aggravate the disturbed state of mind which already exists, would intensify a paralysis of buying power, which at the present moment is having such a disastrous economic effect and would increase the social unrest and economic discontent which is so noticeable in all sections of the land. Private employers have followed an unwise policy of wage cutting and have aroused feeling and passion in the minds of the masses of the people everywhere. They believe that wage cutting on the part of the Government will be the signal for further reductions in private industry.

In my judgment, a great service can be rendered the people by the Congress of the United States if it will officially declare itself in opposition to the lowering of living standards and in favor of the preservation of the wages and conditions which Federal employees have gained through years of struggle and effort. Such action would strengthen and encourage employers in private industry who are endeavoring with all the power they possess to maintain wages, to prevent reductions in salaries, and to encourage buying power, so that the Nation may early regain its normal course. We can not bring back prosperity to the Nation if we continue to destroy buying power through the imposition of wage cuts amounting to millions of dollars.

When the masses of the people are compelled to accept less in wages they are compelled by sheer force of circumstances to buy less. Industry can not produce when workers are unable to buy. There is every reason why the Government should set an example to private industry. At least it should maintain an American standard of living commensurate with the requirements of American citizenship. Congress should be self-possessed even though the managers of private industry are influenced by a wage-cutting hysteria which obviously is having disastrous effects upon the economic life of the Nation. Sane men ought to see that the need of the hour is to build up and increase buying power. We can not, I assure you, bring about economic recovery by weakening and destroying the purchasing power of the masses of the people.

I sincerely hope Congress will find ways and means to economize and reduce Government expenses without reducing wages, without lowering the living standard, and without striking a blow at those intangible human values which after all are the most lasting and abiding of all. May I appeal to you in the name and in behalf of the working people of the Nation, the men and women employed both in public and private enterprises, to oppose pay cuts for Government employees and to boldly announce that so far as the Federal Government is concerned wage cutting must cease, so that the standard of American life and living may be permanently established and securely maintained?

Very sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,

President American Federation of Labor.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning I received a communication, addressed to the Congress of the United States and signed by 62 members of the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University, many of them figures of national and international prominence.

The communication is divided into four short sections, dealing with separate phases of congressional activity and strongly urging prompt action in balancing the Budget, putting into effect economies in Government expenditures, thus demonstrating to the country the capacity and resolution of Congress to meet the situation now confronting it.

In a few brief sentences, this communication sets forth in a forceful manner a cross section of the thought of the American public. Its context is illuminating, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned citizens of Maryland, members of both the major political parties, beg to submit to the Congress the following representations:

First. When the Congress assembled in December, the country faced one of the gravest crises in its history. The processes of industry and trade upon which the well-being of the whole people

depends had become obstructed and disorganized upon a larger scale and in a more disastrous degree than at any previous time. It was evident that without prompt and wise congressional action these conditions were likely not only to continue but to grow worse. Every day's delay in taking such action meant an increase in the distress from which the people were suffering; it meant also that the needed remedies would be less efficacious and more difficult to apply. A reasonable time for the discussion and formulation of the course to be taken must, indeed, be allowed. But half a year has now elapsed, and no decision upon the major questions confronting the National Legislature has been reached. The Congress, as a collective body, still presents to the country the spectacle of vacillating policies, divided counsels, factional bickerings, and partisan recriminations, and individual obstructionists are permitted to delay action by interminable speech making while the state of the Nation becomes steadily worse. Some useful but inadequate measures have, indeed, been enacted, but the two essential duties laid upon the Congress by the national emergency remain unperformed. We beg leave, therefore, to point out to Members of both branches of the Congress that time is of the essence of the remedy, and that the patience of the people is becoming, if it has not already become, exhausted. Whatever is to be done ought to be done now.

Second. The two primary and essential measures called for by the present situation are evident. The first is the prompt adoption of a Budget balanced both by vigorous retrenchment in the expenditures of all Federal departments and by adequate emergency taxation. A budget is not balanced unless the estimates of revenue upon which it is based are the most recent available and are highly conservative; and nothing is gained if, after such a balance of income and expenditures is established, it is speedily upset by vast appropriations for unproductive expenditures for which the Budget does not provide or which can be provided only by further taxation so excessive and ill adjusted as to increase the grave derangement of our economic mechanism, and thus to diminish the very sources from which governmental revenue and industrial credits can be obtained. The reason why a balanced Budget is necessary can hardly need to be stated. It is that the first essential for the reestablishment of confidence and the renewal of enterprise is that the credit of the National Government, and therefore of our general financial system, shall be placed beyond question by any intelligent person, either at home or abroad. The second measure indispensable in the present crisis is that provision be made, under proper safeguards, for the extension of Federal credit to productive and self-liquidating enterprises, both public and private, so that the wheels of industry shall be again set in motion with the least possible delay and also without danger of future impairment of the security of governmental obligations.

Third. Millions of our citizens, able and willing to work, are unemployed. Adequate and timely provision for their needs must be made. The raising and administering of public funds for local relief is primarily the clear duty of State and municipal governments; but if any States are unable to obtain such funds in sufficient amount, it will become necessary that they be assisted through loans from the Federal Treasury. Imperative and urgent though unemployment relief is, it is manifestly only a palliative and in itself an evil. The chief concern of the National Government should be the speedy restoration of normal conditions which will bring the present widespread unemployment to an end. We hope and believe that the government and people of Maryland will do all that is requisite to provide for all citizens of the State who are in need; but the causes which have made them so it is not within the power of this or any State to remove or materially affect by legislative action.

Fourth. A situation such as the present one offers temptation to selfish interests to seek to extract private or local advantage, or seeming advantage, out of the urgency of the general need. Attempts to do this have been apparent in the present congressional session. They are exemplified in proposals to incorporate in pending bills for emergency taxation protective tariffs upon particular commodities—tariffs not determined by their revenue-producing value but solely by the purpose of affording special favors to certain industries, regardless of the effect upon our national economy as a whole. The only consequences of the inclusion of such clauses in these bills will be to convert what should be a common effort to avert national disaster into a shameful struggle for advantage between special or sectional interests; to intensify the existing economic disorders; to increase the burdens of agriculture; to invite reprisals from other nations, and thus to diminish our total export trade; and to exacerbate international ill feeling. A similar attempt is to be seen in proposals to appropriate, under the guise of unemployment relief, large specific sums for unneeded public buildings in particular localities. Such proposals are essentially appeals to local cupidities rather than considered plans for dealing with the fundamentals of the problem, either of relief or of economic reconstruction as a whole. We desire, as we confidently expect, that the representatives of Maryland, in either House, will, in the present critical situation of the whole country, act with a view solely to the national interest, and that they will seek no special advantage for any industry, any locality, or any group in this State or in their several constituencies. Any other attitude would not only be disloyalty to the Nation but would be contrary to the real interests of every individual. Only remedies directed to the correction of the general disorder of our economic

life can be of substantial advantage to any of us. Only national-minded, farseeing, unflinching, and above all prompt action by those into whose hands the conduct of our common affairs has been intrusted, can save the people of the United States from even graver evils than those from which they now suffer.

Respectfully submitted.

Joseph S. Ames, William H. Welch, George E. Barnett, W. O. Weyforth, H. C. Lancaster, Kemp Malone, Ernest Feise, A. O. Lovejoy, R. D. Havens, Hazelton Spencer, James Hart, E. A. Andrews, E. E. Franklin, D. S. Johnson, W. S. Holt, George H. Evans, jr., Sidney Painter, Kent Roberts Greenfield, R. J. Bullock, H. E. Yntema, R. P. Cowles, C. W. E. Miller, L. Wardlaw Miles, S. Page Nelson, J. B. Whitehead, Walter A. Patrick, J. C. S. Frazer, David M. Robinson, Lewis P. Shanks, John C. French, Edward W. Berry, Edward B. Mathews, John H. Gregory, S. J. Mast, Winford H. Smith, Warfield T. Longcope, Edmund P. Carter, Benj. M. Baker, jr., E. Cowles Andrus, Geo. A. Harrop, jr., L. J. Soffer, C. Holmes Boyd, Henry M. Thomas, jr., Moses Paulson, Jos. N. Lielier, T. P. Magill, J. A. Campbell Colston, Angus L. MacLean, Walter L. Denny, Alan M. Chesney, Perren H. Long, Sydney R. Miller, L. Emmett Holt, jr., Mary V. Buell, Paul Padgett, Lay Martin, Benj. Tappen, Edwards A. Park, H. C. Tidwell, Warren M. Cox, jr., Charles O'Donovan, jr., Mary-Lee Carroll.

COMPILATION OF LAWS RELATING TO VETERANS

Mr. HAYDEN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report favorably with an amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29, and I submit a report (No. 759) thereon.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the concurrent resolution be reported for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) submitted by Mr. NORRIS on May 19, 1932, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the compilation of all Federal laws relating to the veterans of our various wars, transmitted by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to the Senate on May 9 (calendar day, May 12), 1932, in response to Senate Resolution No. 412, Seventy-first Congress, be printed as a Senate document with an illustration, and that — additional copies shall be printed, to be distributed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; one copy, upon application, to each post of the Grand Army of the Republic, to each camp of the United Spanish War Veterans, to each post of the American Legion, and to each post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof to insert:

That the letter of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, dated May 12, 1932, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution No. 412 (71st Cong.), a compilation of all Federal laws relating to the veterans of our various wars, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document; and that 15,000 additional copies shall be printed for distribution by the Veterans' Administration of which there may be furnished, upon written application to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, one copy to each post of the Grand Army of the Republic, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to each camp of the United Spanish War Veterans, and to each chapter of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the concurrent resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

REPORT FROM POST OFFICE COMMITTEE

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry nominations of postmasters, which were placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. V. O'Connor, of New York, to be member United States Shipping Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nomination go over for this afternoon. I am not able to take it up now.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I do not want to object to the request of the Senator from Tennessee, but I want to call his attention to the fact that the term expires on the 7th day of June and action should be had one way or the other before that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. The moment that I am able to discuss it I shall be very glad to have it taken up and I will confer with the Senator about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I hope the Senator will confer with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND].

Mr. McKELLAR. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON. I know the intention of the Senator from New York is to respect the wishes of the Senator from Tennessee, but necessity exists for action before the 7th of June.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am quite sure that there will be no reason why it could not be done before that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of B. B. Montgomery to be United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I ask that that may go over until the next executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony Savage to be United States attorney, western district of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of G. Fred Flanders to be United States marshal, southern district of Georgia.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] opposed the confirmation of this nomination when it was up before. I do not see him in the Chamber; and I suggest, therefore, that it go over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I did not understand what the Senator had to say, and I should like to hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Senate be in order so that Senators may be heard.

Mr. HEBERT. When this nomination was submitted at the previous executive session the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] opposed confirmation. He is absent from the Chamber at this moment, and I do not know what his attitude would be; but in his absence I suggested that it might go over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the nomination going over; but the Senator from Delaware reported the nomination.

Mr. HEBERT. I am quite aware of that, and yet I make the statement that he opposed confirmation of the nomination when it was before the Senate previously.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Delaware? I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. HEBERT. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks perhaps the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator must be mistaken, because the Senator from Delaware made the report; but I shall not object to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator is in error; but I am not advised as to whether the Senator from Delaware is opposing this nomination. I suggest that it go over, however, so that there may be no doubt about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. WATSON. I will say, however, that the one he is objecting to is Mr. B. B. Montgomery, nominated for United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That has gone over.

Mr. NORRIS. This is the case of G. Fred Flanders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

Mr. HEBERT subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago I made the statement that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] had objected to the confirmation of the nomination of G. Fred Flanders as United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia. I am informed now, and I think correctly, that I was in error. The Senator from Delaware objected to the nomination of a marshal for a district of Mississippi, and not in the State of Georgia.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator was in error, but still I did not want to have any mistake occur. I think, now, that we ought to ask that that nomination be confirmed.

Mr. HEBERT. Personally I have no objection, Mr. President, and have had none.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of G. Fred Flanders to be United States marshal, southern district of Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CUSTOMS SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John C. Tulloch to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 7, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George D. Hubbard to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 30, Seattle, Wash.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mason M. Patrick to be member, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, for a term of three years, from July 1, 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leo W. Tucker to be surgeon, Public Health Service, to rank as such from June 15, 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry G. Hamlet to be commandant, with the rank of rear admiral, for term of four years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur Wellington Doland to be register, Spokane, Wash.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. ODDIE. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of Harry Aitken, to be postmaster at Clearfield, Iowa; and in that case I ask that the nomination be rereferred to the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator if he would have any objection to making the same request with regard to Calendar No. 4615. The matter has been called to my attention recently; and I should like to have the nomination taken back to the committee, and then I will confer with the Senator about it.

Mr. ODDIE. At the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will ask that that course be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, those two nominations will be excepted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Tennessee if the nominations of the postmasters I was conferring with him about are on the calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not on the calendar, and I have not yet had an opportunity to confer about them.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar will be confirmed en bloc except the two referred to by the Senator from Nevada.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc; and in view of the fact that these boys graduate to-morrow from the academy, and should receive their commissions at that time, I ask unanimous consent that the President be at once notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IN THE NAVY

Mr. HALE. I have also the nomination of Midshipman Halford A. Knoertzer to be an ensign in the Navy. For some reason this name did not appear with that of the other midshipmen a few days ago when their nominations came before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that that nomination be confirmed, and the President notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be read to the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Midshipman Halford A. Knoertzer to be an ensign in the Navy, revocable for two years, from the 2d day of June, 1932.

Mr. HALE. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed and the President notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed and the President will be notified.

Mr. HALE. I report from the Naval Affairs Committee sundry nominations for the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The other nominations will go to the calendar.

The nominations referred to are as follows:

Lieut. Commander Morton L. Deyo to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of December, 1931.

Lieut. Commander Harry G. Patrick to be a commander in the Navy from the 12th day of March, 1932.

Lieut. Commander Alfred E. Montgomery to be a commander in the Navy from the 8th day of April, 1932.

Lieut. Albert R. Myers to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1931.

Lieut. Francis R. McDonnell to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1931.

Lieut. (junior grade) John W. Price, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1931.

Lieut. (junior grade) Robert M. Morris to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of December, 1931.

Lieut. (junior grade) Wells L. Field to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of February, 1932.

Lieut. (junior grade) Harry A. Dunn, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of May, 1932.

Surg. Charles S. Stephenson to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 1st day of November, 1931.

Passed Asst. Surg. Howell C. Johnston to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of February, 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the calendar.

The Senate resumed legislative session.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, June 2, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 1, 1932

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Anthony Savage to be United States attorney, western district of Washington.

UNITED STATES MARSHALL

G. Fred Flanders to be United States marshal, southern district of Georgia.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John C. Tulloch to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 7, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

George D. Hubbard to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 30, Seattle, Wash.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Arthur Wellington Doland to be register, Spokane, Wash.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mason M. Patrick to be a member Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leo W. Tucker to be surgeon, Public Health Service, to rank as such from June 15, 1932.

COAST GUARD

Harry G. Hamlet to be commandant, with the rank of rear admiral.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Halford A. Knoertzer to be an ensign.

MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Walter Asmuth, jr.	Julian G. Humiston.
James C. Bigler.	Cleo R. Keen.
Robert O. Bisson.	Roland O. Lucier.
Alpha L. Bowser, jr.	William B. B. Lyons.
George N. Carroll.	Ellsworth N. Murray.
Clarence O. Cobb.	Robert R. Porter.
Thomas J. Colley.	Paul J. Shovestul.
George Corson.	James G. Smith.
Robert L. Denig, jr.	Marvin T. Starr.
Hector de Zayas.	Forest C. Thompson.
William K. Enright.	Joseph Thompson.
Marion A. Fawcett.	Harvey C. Tschirgi.
Oscar A. Heinlein, jr.	Howard J. Turton.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William L. Jones, Parrish.
Gladys M. Bomar, Woodward.

ALASKA

Charles A. Sheldon, Seward.

ARIZONA

Paul D. Snyder, Ajo.

CALIFORNIA

Frances L. Summers, Arbuckle.
Dwight E. Knapp, Garberville.
William Henson, Riverdale.
John H. Strauch, jr., San Gabriel.
Marie E. Forster, San Juan Capistrano.
Warren A. Woods, Suisun City.
Harry E. Meyers, Yuba City.

CONNECTICUT

Edward S. Coulter, Essex.
Judson B. Griswold, Ivoryton.
Margaret C. Kelly, Noroton.
Edward S. Lewis, Portland.

FLORIDA

Elia B. Colson, Deerfield.
Royal W. Storrs, De Funiak Springs.
Walter E. Clark, Fruitland Park.
Clara E. Mariner, Oviedo.
John B. Carlin, St. Cloud.

GEORGIA

John T. Cagle, Ball Ground.
William H. Astin, Palmetto.
George W. Bryan, Rossville.

HAWAII

Antone Silva, Hawi.

IDAHO

Edith M. Alexander, Genesee.

ILLINOIS

Jay F. Smith, Blue Island.
Russell S. Brown, Brighton.
Purl A. Scott, Chrisman.
Harley S. Wheatley, De Soto.
Robert K. Church, Dowell.
Orville Donaldson, Edgewood.
Roy O. Benson, Glenn Ellyn.
Esther A. Lundberg, Greenview.
Leo M. Stoecklin, Highland.
Fred S. Wallich, Knoxville.
William A. Abernathie, McClure.
Oldham Paisley, Marion.
Leonard E. Sheppard, National Stock Yards.
Eugenia L. Prange, New Douglas.
John C. Speck, Rankin.
Lawrence M. Goodyear, Watseka.
Claude A. Webster, Westmont.
John F. Shimkus, Westville.
Laura A. Gregory, Willisville.

INDIANA

Herschell A. Vermilya, Brownstown.
Clara I. Boesen, Griffith.
George E. Norman, Jasper.
Glenn B. King, Kirklin.
Leland L. Bond, Liberty.
John A. Jones, Marion.
Harold P. Willoughby, Spencer.
Detroit M. Simmons, Winchester.
George E. Thompson, Wingate.

IOWA

Melvin V. Smith, Akron.
Theodore B. Satory, Albert City.
William M. Bausch, Ashton.
John C. Dow, College Springs.
Elmer Akers, Decatur.
Dell P. Glazier, Fort Madison.
James O. Vail, Garden Grove.
Rose M. Fischbach, Granville.
Henry W. Huibregtse, Hull.
Fred R. Foster, Humeston.
John E. Mieras, Maurice.
Leon R. Valentine, Murray.
Elizabeth O'Reilly, New Albin.
Loys E. Couch, Newell.
Lyle J. McLaughlin, Schaller.

KANSAS

Herbert L. Fryback, Colby.
Carroll B. Kelly, Wakeeney.

KENTUCKY

Susie H. Curran, Bedford.
Everett Hickman, Burlington.
George D. Scott, Carlisle.
George L. Wallace, Central City.
Trilby A. Russell, Kevil.
Gertrude Berry, La Center.
Mattie L. Wood, Russellville.
Henry H. Hargan, Vine Grove.
Harry Beall, Warsaw.
Era W. Peniston, Wilmore.

LOUISIANA

Mildred P. Prescott, Lutchet.

MARYLAND

Walter J. Crowe, East New Market.
Mary B. Workman, Fort Howard.

Eunice W. Dement, Indianhead.
George E. Parsons, Marion Station.
George S. Stevens, Millington.
Lawrence M. Fraley, Oakland.
Allan Urie, Rock Hall.
Esther C. Baker, Woodbine.

MASSACHUSETTS

Henry N. Wixon, Dennis Port.

MICHIGAN

Frank Beedon, Crosswell.
Benjamin W. Somers, Hesperia.
Margaret J. Stuber, Lexington.

MINNESOTA

Howard O. Haggberg, Isle.
Homer B. Hanson, Morton.
Dennis T. Mulhern, Waverly.

MISSISSIPPI

John B. Going, Calhoun City.
Ernest McC. Hawkins, Corinth.
Mills T. Williams, Durant.
Lena W. Price, Tutwiler.
Francis C. Hayden, Vaughan.

MISSOURI

Walter L. Meyer, Auxvasse.
Earl E. Pillow, Clarkton.
Benjamin O. Byers, Creighton.
Otto A. Green, Galt.
Henry A. Illers, Jackson.
Mansfield W. Duston, Kingston.
Charles F. McKay, Knox City.
Edward F. Walden, Morehouse.
Samuel S. Rutan, Odessa.
James E. King, Savannah.
Dorothy M. Ritter, Wellington.

NEBRASKA

Milton R. Cox, Arapahoe.
Edward F. Farley, jr., Bancroft.
Hannah P. Eggleston, Bennet.
W. Ross Pedley, Bertrand.
Stanley E. Hemenway, Clearwater.
Archie L. Smith, Imperial.
Jacob H. Jimerson, Liberty.
Charles O. Lewis, Marquette.
Frank C. Patton, Omaha.
Arthur H. Logan, Ponca.
Myrtle L. Anderson, Republican City.
Lawrence A. Kibbee, Winnebago.

NEW JERSEY

Lyle W. Morehouse, Little Falls.
Harry B. Mason, Pompton Lakes.

NEW YORK

Erwin Smith, Annandale on Hudson.
Nellie Fredricson, Cornwall on the Hudson.
Rudolph Silha, East Islip.
Joseph W. Cermak, East Northport.
Wallace Thurston, Floral Park.
Marcus O. Howell, Glen Head.
Miles C. Dales, Laurens.
Harry M. Lanpher, Lowville.
William W. Carpenter, Monticello.
Clarence H. Ash, Nedrow.
Copeland E. Smith, Olean.
J. Frank Smith, Patterson.
Alfred M. Butts, Sag Harbor.
William K. Dunwell, Southampton.
Elsie V. Webb, Union Springs.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ruth F. White, Colerain.
Robert H. Clayton, Erlanger.
Elmer D. Lansing, Montreat.
Lucile L. White, Salemburg.
Robert H. Dixon, Siler City.

OHIO

Pearl W. Athey, Belpre.
Nestor J. Taylor, Beverly.
William F. Kubicek, Independence.
Robert E. Friel, Lore City.
Don B. Stanley, Lowell.
William A. Ray, Mount Sterling.
Frank M. Murphy, Murray City.
Rufus A. Borland, West Jefferson.

OKLAHOMA

Helen M. Lutes, Bennington.
Samuel H. Bundy, Bethany.
James A. Todd, Calumet.
Horatio E. Downing, Jet.
Alvin S. Gibson, Roosevelt.
James B. Cox, Stilwell.
Joseph H. Hopkins, Woodward.

PENNSYLVANIA

Wilferd R. Troxel, Aliquippa.
Arthur E. Shannon, Beaverdale.
William C. Drager, Boiling Springs.
Wade M. Henderson, Brookville.
Edward L. Beechey, Clymer.
John Standring, Darby.
Clyde S. McNeely, Dauphin.
Lewis M. Watkins, jr., Drexel Hill.
John H. Lyter, Elizabethville.
Charles G. Fullerton, Freeport.
Lionel W. Stevens, Knoxville.
Ray K. Garman, Lemoyne.
Paul L. Boyd, Mars.
Maurice G. Coffey, Mill Hall.
Seth E. Sterner, Montgomery.
Thomas B. Painter, Muncy.
Teresa G. Burke, Renovo.
Laura C. Ehler, Shippensburg.
Mark Mumma, Steelton.
Walter D. Lewis, Ulysses.
John N. Snyder, Williamstown.
Albert A. Campbell, Zelenople.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Paul M. Rickert, Sisseton.
Edward J. Groat, Thunder Hawk.

TENNESSEE

Noble C. White, Pulaski.

UTAH

John McPhee, Salt Lake City.

VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Davis, Altavista.
Joseph E. Dinwiddie, Appomattox.
Robert L. Olinger, Blacksburg.
Samuel T. Ranson, Brems Bluff.
George A. Chrisman, Christiansburg.
Sam B. Jessee, Cleveland.
Hugh T. Arwood, Disputanta.
Bernard Willing, Irvington.
Guthrie R. Dunton, jr., White Stone.

WEST VIRGINIA

Gertrude O. Smith, Oak Hill.
Homer S. Hatfield, Williamson.

WISCONSIN

William R. Hartley, Fountain City.
Francis W. Altenburg, Hazel Green.
Conrad Baetz, Two Rivers.
C. Clyde Harris, Waupun.

WYOMING

Frank G. Brown, Fort Laramie.
Benjamin G. Rodda, Gebo.
Edna M. Booth, Sunrise.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Hulbert A. Woolfall, rector of St. Mark's Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art Heroic Love keep alive in our hearts that adventurous spirit that makes men scorn the way of safety that Thy will may be done. Give us understanding to love widely, power to build bravely, the spirit to witness humbly, and the mind to think fairly. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10236. An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to said bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. SMOOT, Mr. WATSON, Mr. REED, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. KING to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONGRESSIONAL WORK

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on congressional work.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, expenses of government, locally and nationally, are too high and must be reduced, and this can be done without impairing its efficiency. Instead of increasing taxes, appropriations should be decreased. In attempting to reduce these expenses many obstacles are confronted. When a reduction is recommended in any appropriation bill in Congress the department affected at once begins a campaign against such reductions. If these departments and the administration would assist us, great reductions could be made. When the War Department appropriation bill was considered in the House, it made reductions below the recommendations of the President in the sum of \$24,569,901.

The Secretary of War, Chief of Staff, and the administration opposed these reductions. The appropriation bills that have passed the House this session have made appropriations below the recommendations of the President in the sum of \$161,455,101.56, and the total amount saved under the appropriations for 1932 is the sum of \$563,601,223.35. Some of the big papers criticized the House for not meeting the President's demands on reductions, but the facts are that the House has greatly reduced the amounts recommended by the President.

The administration opposed the economy bill by trying to substitute the President's plan, and the President opposed a consolidation of the War and Navy Departments which would have saved another \$100,000,000 per year. Savings made in the economy bill, with the reductions made in the appropriation bills below the amounts recommended by the President, amount to more than \$200,000,000. The President did not say anything about expenses and taxes when he wanted his \$2,000,000,000 Reconstruction Finance Corporation act and his moratorium on foreign debts passed. I opposed these two measures because I was convinced that they were not in the interest of the American people. These foreign countries should pay us what they owe us and not saddle their debts upon the American taxpayers.

I voted for the economy bill and voted to reduce my own salary and office expenses along with the other salaries. Millions of dollars could be saved by abolishing certain bureaus and commissions and consolidating others and thus preventing duplications. I have always supported such legislation.

All the money to run the Government of the United States, with the exception of the amount collected through

the customhouses and in fines, is derived from the income tax. Under the present law a man and wife without children must have an income of more than \$3,500 per year before they pay any direct tax into the Treasury of the United States. Then there is an exemption of \$400 for each child. Therefore if a man and his wife have four children they pay no income tax unless their income is in excess of \$5,100 per year. I favor an income tax, and taxes should be borne largely by those most able to pay.

These international bankers, with their big incomes, tried to impose a sales tax upon the people and, if they had been successful, they could have had their own income taxes reduced. I opposed the sales tax and assisted in striking that provision from the tax bill. When this tax bill was considered in the House an amendment was adopted providing a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent on sales on the stock exchanges. These sales for last year amounted to the enormous sum of \$32,000,000,000 and the tax proposed would amount to the sum of \$80,000,000. Several of us tried to have that rate increased to 1 per cent, and this would have increased our income from this source alone to the sum of \$320,000,000. No assistance was given us by the administration. You remember how these operators fleeced this country out of millions of dollars and they should be taxed.

Agriculture is our leading industry and prosperity must begin on the farm. I introduced farm bill H. R. 7797, which bill provides a plan for the farmers to get at least cost of producing that part of their crops consumed in this country. The bill abolishes the Farm Board and its excessive salaries and will greatly reduce Government expenses. It will prevent the salary of \$75,000 per year paid the vice president and general manager of the American Cotton Cooperative Association. With cotton at 5 cents per pound, as last fall, it would take 3,000 bales to pay that one salary.

The president and general manager of the Grain Stabilization Corporation receives \$50,000 per year salary, and, with wheat at 30 cents per bushel, which the farmers received last fall, it would take 166,666 $\frac{2}{3}$ bushels to pay that salary. The bill also prevents speculation in farm products on the stock exchanges. If this bill had been in effect last year, the farmers would have received \$1.09 per bushel for their wheat, 89 cents per bushel for their corn, 54 cents per bushel for their oats, and 16 cents per pound for their cotton. That is what the Department of Agriculture said it cost on an average to produce these crops. No additional appropriation or expense would be necessary, as the Department of Agriculture makes these estimates each year and has the machinery for administering the bill. On the 12th day of April, 1932, I delivered an address in this House and urged the speedy enactment of this bill, as I did before the Committee on Agriculture. It is indorsed by the entire Oklahoma delegation, by the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, and by numerous farm organizations in Oklahoma and throughout the country. That part of the bill to secure the cost of production is also indorsed by the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am glad to say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture recently reported a bill favorably with that provision. I shall continue the fight for the passage of this bill or some similar bill to save agriculture from ruin.

I introduced a bill to give an extension of two years on Federal farm loans and providing for withholding foreclosures. If Congress would enact this bill, similar laws would follow in the different States, and this would give farmers an opportunity to save their homes.

Many of our leading economists agree that one of the greatest needs at this time is more money in circulation. Several bills for that purpose are pending in Congress, and if legislation of that kind were enacted and an effective bill on agriculture passed, then we would see a return to prosperity. The issuance and control of money must be taken out of the hands of the international bankers and the Government administered in behalf of our people.

I supported the bill to have 40,000,000 bushels of wheat ground into flour and given to the hungry. We will not let people starve in America in times when they can not find

any work. I have always supported legislation for the benefit of our women and children. The security and sanctity of the home and family must be preserved. On the 18th day of February, 1932, I addressed the House on the peace resolution or "taking the profits out of war and draft capital in the event of another war." The manufacturers of death-dealing war material and the profiteers should know that if we have another war, they will not make any profits out of that war. This will do much to minimize the cause of war.

When the French debt to the United States was funded in the sum of \$4,025,000,000 more than one-half of that debt was canceled, which amounted to more than \$2,000,000,000. The Italian debt was likewise funded in the sum of \$2,042,000,000, and 75 per cent, or about \$1,500,000,000 of that debt was canceled. These cancellations would much more than pay our veterans their adjusted-service certificates or would greatly reduce the expenses of our Government. I opposed these foreign-debt settlements and oppose a cancellation of the debts due us from foreign countries amounting to \$11,777,316,710.38. American investments of all kinds in foreign countries amount to \$45,000,000,000, and this value would be increased if the international bankers succeeded in canceling our foreign debt.

I always opposed high tariff laws which compel our farmers to pay twice as much for farm machinery as they did in 1914 and greatly increase the cost of living. I have succeeded in having 36 bills pass Congress and reported favorably by the committees, in addition to other benefits to the district. Most of my office work consists in handling claims for soldiers and their dependents, and I have been successful in putting thousands of them through the bureau. I like to help those who need assistance. Experience and knowing how to do it get results in Congress as it does in other lines of business. No matter how good a man's intentions are, he can not succeed here unless he knows how to do the work. I have worked my best to get our Indian affairs settled and what there is left paid to the members of the tribes. I was reared in the old Indian Territory part of Oklahoma and moved from what is now Garvin County to Cleveland County, where I now reside. The needs and desires of the people whom I have the honor to represent in Congress are therefore familiar to me. I have done my best, the record will show the results, and have always supported legislation for our disabled soldiers, working people, and business interests.

INDIANA LIMESTONE AS BUILDING MATERIAL

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on limestone building material, and to incorporate therein a letter from the Treasury Department, and certain parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, in their official capacity, are often called upon to make decisions which are subject to misinterpretation. There are always those who, for political purposes, seek to capitalize some action of a Representative and to alienate a group of voters because of some official procedure which the public does not understand. It is for this reason that I am reciting the facts concerning my services to the limestone industry of Monroe and Owen Counties of Indiana.

The Federal Government's program of construction of buildings has been inaugurated since I became your Representative and Indiana limestone has led all types of building stone, used by Uncle Sam. Most of the credit for this fact must go to former Representative Richard N. Elliot, of Connersville, Ind., who was chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, but he was persistently supported by Representative Wood and myself. So zealous were we in our efforts that we became known as the Indiana limestone bloc. Members of Congress from other States voiced heavy protests against the Indiana group in the House of Representatives where this building program originated.

May I quote from my own remarks, "Indiana limestone, material for public buildings," found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February, 1926:

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, while we have under consideration the expenditure of millions of dollars for the construction of public buildings in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States, it seems to me most appropriate to call my colleague's attention to the building qualities of Indiana limestone. This natural stone has been used quite extensively, and because of its great merit for durability, artistic elegance, and economy will be used more in the erection of public buildings. Oolitic of finest quality is one of the great natural resources of Indiana, found in Lawrence, Monroe, and Owen counties. It is known as Indiana limestone—sometimes called Bedford stone.

Builders of all time have discovered that oolitic limestone meets the requirements for durability. St. Paul's Cathedral, of London, built of English limestone, is historic, but English limestone is but a poor second in quality to the deposits found in Indiana.

Here in our Capital City are public buildings and beautiful residences that are testimonials of the value and beauty of this stone. Among the latter are the Wilkins residence, now occupied by Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, and the beautiful home offered to Congress by Mrs. Henderson for the use of the Vice President. The interior walls of the House and Senate Office Buildings, the Chamber of Commerce, Veterans' Bureau, and many banks are built of limestone.

In the business world are many specimens of commercial buildings that have put Indiana limestone at the top of the list as a material for construction. New York City has favored this product in the erection of the Grand Central Terminal Station, Cunard Building, Standard Oil Building, New York Cotton Exchange, while Chicago has showed her preference in the Tribune Building, the Straus Building, and the University Club.

There are five State capitols constructed of Indiana limestone. Among these is the one at Indianapolis, in the State where Mother Nature bestowed the material resource of this deposit of stone.

Think of a building stone that is thirty-five times as strong as is necessary to bear the load. Indiana limestone has a strength of 7,000 pounds per square inch on 2-inch cubes and more on larger stone and this is twice the strength of the best quality of concrete.

Oolitic comes in three colors—buff, gray, and variegated. It has fire-resisting qualities. It can be heated to 1,000° F. and then drenched with water without any appreciable bad effect.

Mr. Speaker, Indiana hopes to share in this great Government project and wants to contribute of her natural resources to help enrich the Nation. We can not believe that this is an unholly desire.

If these public buildings are constructed by virtue of the so-called Elliott bill, which I supported, then they should be built of a material of strength, durability, and beauty. To have all the elements of successful construction, to meet the requirements of not only this age but the future generations, to obtain the satisfaction of having buildings of which we can always be proud as to looks and permanence, and to do this at a reasonable cost, in which value is received for the expenditure, I would recommend that these Government buildings be constructed of Indiana limestone, the Nation's building stone.

Time has disclosed that the Treasury Department has accepted the advice given by Representative Elliott, myself, and others in the construction of the post offices, Federal buildings built pursuant to the Elliott bill. In further evidence of this conclusion I here incorporate a letter of S. Lowman, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. In percentage of cost in the public-building program, limestone obtains from 55 to 65 per cent.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, May 26, 1932.

HON. ARTHUR H. GREENWOOD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 14 and also to telephone communication of May 24 concerning the relative cost of Indiana limestone and other materials used in facing Government buildings.

As was explained to you over the telephone, this department does not have the information that you requested. The contracts awarded by this department are on a lump-sum basis and do not contain unit prices for any of the materials. However, it is believed that the following information will give you what you requested over the telephone:

The buildings constructed by this department may be, for the purposes of this information, divided into five classes, as follows:

1. Brick faced, with stone trim: The majority of the smaller buildings are brick faced, with a varying amount of stone trim. The trim is usually limestone, but in some few cases is sandstone, marble, or granite. This type of building constitutes approximately 62 per cent of the total number of buildings.

2. Limestone faced: In some cases, where local conditions demand, the smaller buildings are faced with limestone. The majority of the larger buildings are also faced with this material. The average building in this class will have granite curb, steps, base course, and water table; that is, everything up to the first

floor will be of granite and all above that will be of limestone. This class constitutes approximately 30 per cent of the total number of buildings.

3. Sandstone faced: In some cases where there is a local sandstone this material has been used as facing. The average building in this class would be the same as the average building in the second class except that sandstone is used in place of limestone. This class constitutes approximately 5 per cent of the total number of buildings.

4. Marble faced: In some of the more elaborate buildings and in places where marble is quarried, this material has been used in facing buildings. The average building in this class would have granite below the first floor and marble above. This class constitutes approximately 1 per cent of the total number of buildings.

5. Granite faced: The same description would apply to this class as is given to the fourth class except that granite is used throughout. This class constitutes approximately 2 per cent of the total number of buildings.

The above percentages have been based on the total number of buildings constructed without regard to the cost of those buildings.

The following percentages are on a basis of cost and are only for stone used in the facing of the buildings:

Granite, from 5 to 10 per cent.

Marble, from 15 to 20 per cent.

Sandstone, from 15 to 20 per cent.

Limestone, from 55 to 65 per cent.

It is believed that this information is what you desired; but if not, we will be glad to help you further.

Very truly yours,

S. LOWMAN,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

As a further evidence of the services and support I rendered in helping to promote the passage of the bill for the construction of public buildings, I here incorporate a letter from former Representative Elliott, of Indiana, who was chairman of the committee:

ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 21, 1932.

HON. ARTHUR H. GREENWOOD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: In reply to your communication received to-day in regard to your attitude toward the public building program of which I had charge as chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, I wish to say that I appreciated your valuable assistance in the passage of all of the bills which were necessary in order to establish the great building program in the city of Washington, as well as throughout the country. You were one of the many members that I had to depend upon at all times to get this program through. I remember very well the "scrap" that we had in the House of Representatives over the question of whether limestone or granite should be used in the construction of the Boston post office. You took the side of the limestone along with Congressman Will Wood and myself, and we were able at that time to swing the House of Representatives in favor of limestone. Unfortunately, however, we were later defeated.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

RICHARD N. ELLIOTT.

You will keep in mind that the buildings covered by this Federal construction program are all of a utilitarian character. The life of these buildings is on the average about 100 years. I have always contended that for Government office buildings there is no building material so reasonable in price, considering adaptability, appearance, and value, that can excel Indiana limestone. Also keep in mind that the George Rogers Clark Memorial at Vincennes is not this kind of a building. It is in the nature of a memorial which has no utilitarian purposes. If it is to have the superartistic features proposed and designed by its creator, the advice of the designing architect's recommendations should be accepted and followed. This is what the commission did in building the Clark Memorial at Vincennes with exterior of granite and interior of limestone.

Again let me call your attention to another special effort, which I—as your Representative—made to have Indiana limestone used in Government buildings. In the year 1930 the Government was planning to build a post-office building in down-town Boston, replacing one constructed of granite. The bill in Congress provided \$6,000,000, but the House Members from New England were pleading for an appropriation of \$6,750,000. Their reasons for such a demand were plainly set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (March 19, 1930). I quote Mr. LUCE, Representative from Massachusetts:

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is planned to build in the heart of Boston a Federal building. Should the figures stay at \$6,000,000,

the building, which is to be 21 stories in height, will have a granite facing up to about 50 feet, leaving more than 300 feet to be faced with Indiana limestone. We ask that the whole structure be built of granite for these reasons:

First. The business depression is affecting New England more than any other section of the country.

Second. The economic reason, in that the expenditure of money for public buildings stimulates business in every direction.

Third. A sentimental reason. We of New England want our monumental edifices erected by the Nation to be built of that material which has been the pride of New England from its earliest days—granite.

Fourth. We want the material that endures, and that is granite. There is next what I call the artistic or esthetic reason. Trained architects threw up their hands in abhorrence at the idea of putting two kinds of stone in the main walls of such a building as this is to be.

Mr. Speaker, we want this building a thing of beauty, a thing of massive grandeur, a thing which shall impress the people with the dignity of the American Government. We ask that you grant the plea of those who must live with this building.

I wish that space permitted my printing excerpts from all speeches made on this subject, but, since this instrument deals chiefly with my efforts in behalf of Indiana limestone, I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date my own remarks:

Mr. WOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, we have a building program that was adopted at the last Congress. I supported the program, together with my colleague from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT]. Certain authorizations have been made to build public buildings throughout all parts of the United States. To increase the authorization or appropriation on any one project now means to cut down the prospect of building public buildings in many States under that former authorization.

To increase this appropriation by \$750,000 will mean to take \$75,000 each from 10 public buildings in other parts of the United States.

Of course the unemployment situation is bad everywhere, but it does not relieve that situation generally to furnish more employment in New England. We have unemployment in Indiana, and at these 10 places where these public buildings will be built there is unemployment to be taken care of.

Of course granite is a great building material, but it is very expensive, and it is an expense that is not needed. The engineers and chemists of our Government have determined that Indiana limestone is the premier building material. So confident are they of the permanent qualities of this stone that they have accepted it and adopted it for the public-building program in the Capital City in the triangle. That should be sufficient recommendation to this House.

Something has been said about the quality of Indiana limestone. Indiana limestone is 97 per cent pure carbonate of lime with a small proportion of silica, magnesia, and oxide of iron. It is a perfect resistant to corrosive gases and acids contained in city smoke-laden air. It is a most valuable quality for permanence.

The pyramids of Egypt, the temples of Karnak, St. Paul's Cathedral in England, were built of limestone, but the English limestone is a poor second to Indiana limestone. The great cathedral of Mount St. Albans, which the specifications say is to stand 10,000 years, is built of Indiana limestone.

On North Sixteenth Street the great Scottish Rite Temple is being built of Indiana limestone. The Grand Central Terminal Station in New York City is built of Indiana limestone. The engineers report that it is thirty-five times as strong as necessary to bear the load. [Applause.]

As you now know something of my Indiana-limestone activities in the Congress, I will further record a few explanatory notes relative to my vote on the kind of material to be used in the construction of the George Rogers Clark Memorial, at Vincennes, Ind. Please understand that these remarks are in no sense an apology. When I have finished, the thoughtful reader will decide, I trust, that I cast the vote of a statesman, rather than the vote of a politician.

As a member of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission, appointed by the Speaker of the House, I, together with 14 other men, was charged with the expending of \$1,500,000 of Federal money for the construction of a memorial to Clark and his copatriots, who, during the Revolutionary War, saved the Northwest Territory for the United States. Our histories remind us that this was an event of national importance.

The Clark Memorial is the finest monument built by Federal money to be found west of the Allegheny Mountains and is comparable to the Lincoln Memorial on the beautiful Potomac at Washington.

Speeches quoted in this article plainly state the relative merits of granite and limestone. As building material for public buildings, Indiana limestone holds undisputed place; no one is prouder of this Hoosier product than I. The Government engineers recognize the merits of Indiana limestone for buildings to be used for offices and business purposes and Indiana has received a lion's share of orders for this material to be used in the construction of these buildings.

The Lincoln Memorial at Washington, D. C., is of granite and marble exterior and limestone interior; the recently dedicated Masonic memorial to George Washington at Alexandria, Va., is also constructed of light-colored granite similar to the stone being used in the memorial at Vincennes.

The memorial at Vincennes is in no sense a building for utilitarian purposes. The design was selected in competition with more than 50 other designs. The decision was made by a jury of architects and men of artistic tastes because of the great beauty and artistic appearance of the proposed memorial. It is being built for the centuries to commemorate a great historical episode, important in the life of our Nation.

The designing architect is a man of outstanding national reputation in this class of work. It was his recommendation that his design would be best executed in granite. The supervising architect, Mr. Hubert Parsons, a man of wide experience and employed in the Capital to supervise many of the Nation's most recent Government projects, also recommended the Clark Memorial as designed be built of granite. The commission appointed a special committee of six of its members to investigate and report. They reported that the memorial should be erected of white granite. These recommendations were also approved by the Federal Fine Arts Commission at Washington, D. C.

The decision to be made by me was not as a Representative of the second district but rather as a member of the commission selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to expend Federal money on a Federal project and best carry out the mandate of Congress. This mandate was to build the best, most permanent, beautiful, and acceptable memorial for the appropriation provided.

The interior of the Clark Memorial is being constructed of Indiana limestone quarried and milled in Monroe County, Ind.

There has been much political comment in newspapers about the proposed granite being from Canada. There never was any truth in that statement. Mr. Heath, the contractor, of Greencastle, Ind., fully understood the specifications called for domestically produced stone. Before bidding he asked for proposals upon granite quarried and milled in Vermont of the quality shown by the sample. The stone accepted and used is being provided from the quarries at Woodbury, Vt. Everyone connected with the commission knew this when the newspaper comment was criticizing the commission about Canadian stone. This stone is being quarried and milled by American workmen at the usual prices paid for such work.

At the time of the action by the commission no independent stone company expressed dissatisfaction with its decision. Many independents expressed entire satisfaction with the commission's decision. One company attempted, through political and newspaper channels, to force the commission to disregard the architect, the committee, and the supervising architect's recommendation and give the contract to this company for economic or business reasons. They hired an attorney, who used the Indianapolis newspapers for publicity purposes. This attorney extended remarks in the newspapers about the illegality of the contract, but so far has tried his case only in the newspapers and not in the courts.

Your Representative has been faithful to every duty and every trust to his constituents in the limestone business and will, as in the past, continue to serve them faithfully in every legitimate way. We feel that time will vindicate our action in this matter. If any citizens of my district feel aggrieved at my action, I will be more than glad to confer with them and give complete details. Anyone interested

is invited to go to Vincennes, where the memorial is now completed to the roof line, and see the character of the structure, the material being used, and give me his or her reaction to correctness of the commission's decision as it is demonstrated in the memorial itself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing two addresses, one by Fred Breckman, representative of the National Grange, and the other by W. Jett Lauck, who addressed a meeting at the caucus room in the House Office Building on Thursday, May 26, attended only by Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I object.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BUT NEVER APPROVED BY THREE-FOURTHS OF THE STATES

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of State in reply to an inquiry submitted to the Secretary of State as to the number of outstanding constitutional amendments since the beginning of Congress, which amendments have not been acted upon by three-fourths of the States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, that information has been published heretofore, and can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. But everyone is not as familiar with all parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as is the gentleman from Wisconsin. This codifies them and puts them all on one page.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter from the Secretary of State written in answer to an inquiry by me as to the number of proposals to amend the Constitution, which proposals have been submitted to the States, but on which three-fourths of the States have never acted favorably. The Secretary of State's letter contains information on this subject which is authentic. The substance of the letter is as follows:

The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 18, 1932, in which you inquire whether constitutional amendments were submitted to the States in 1789, 1810, 1861, and 1924 which were never ratified by the requisite three-fourths of the States.

You are informed that Congress did in the years mentioned propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States which were not ratified by the requisite number of States. Congress, by a resolution of March 4, 1789 (1 Stat. 97 f.), proposed an amendment concerning the apportionment of Representatives and an amendment concerning the compensation of Members which were never ratified by the States, as well as 10 other amendments which were subsequently ratified. A resolution of November 27, 1810 (2 Stat. 613), proposed an amendment concerning titles of nobility. The abolition of slavery was the subject of a similar resolution (12 Stat. 251) approved March 2, 1861, and a resolution passed on June 3, 1924, which is undated as it appears in the statutes (43 Stat. 670), and which was deposited in the Department of State June 4, 1924, proposed an amendment concerning child labor.

It is suggested that further information concerning proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States may be found in the following documents:

Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, arranged, digested, and indexed by Charles C. Tansill (S. Doc. No. 93, 69th Cong., 1st sess.).

Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, prepared by M. A. Musmanno (H. Doc. No. 551, 70th Cong., 2d sess.).

It is also suggested that you may find information of interest to you concerning proposed amendments to the Constitution in certain remarks by the Hon. HENRY F. ASHBURST, United States Senator from Arizona, which appear on pages 4115 ff. of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 17, 1932.

RELIEF OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, Congress has now been in session for about six months, and has so far failed to take

any fundamental steps to solve the two most important problems facing the country to-day—unemployment and relief for agriculture. Some palliative legislation has been enacted.

Congress has authorized the distribution of 40,000,000 bushels of the Federal Farm Board wheat in the shape of flour, and feed for livestock in the drought areas, and 23,000,000 bushels has been used to relieve distress among the needy.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as far as it goes, does assist business and, in the way of crop-production loans, farmers. But lending money, either to business men or farmers, is not going to restore buying power to the unemployed and their families or give cost of production to agriculture. Neither will "balancing the Budget," about which we hear so much these days, nor "cutting Government expenses to the bone" do this. Both of these are worthy of our best attention, but while we have been concentrating our efforts on these endeavors in the past months we have done practically nothing to put an end to the existing depression or to prevent a recurrence of it.

WHAT CAUSED DEPRESSION

Farmers and workers are not responsible for the distressing conditions to-day. Primarily, the depression has been brought about by taking out of this country since the war some \$30,000,000,000. This huge sum has been diverted to foreign channels, both as loans to governments and in so-called investments, practically all of which are now worthless. It is obvious that this amount of money can not be removed from circulation here without resulting in deflation all along the line. The blame for this rests squarely on the shoulders of our financial leaders, who, more than any others, have had control of our finances ever since the World War. It must be obvious to all that they have made a sorry failure. Having come now to the end of their rope, they are, on the one hand, begging Congress for relief, while on the other we still find them trying to dictate to us as to the kind of legislation we shall enact. I think it is about time to face the facts and do something for the rank and file of our people instead of for this "invisible government" which has been at the helm far too long for the welfare of our Nation.

Through the passage of the Esch-Cummins railroad bill in 1920, freight rates were increased 60 per cent on farm products. In the same year, the Federal Reserve Board secretly and arbitrarily adopted the deflation policy, which was the beginning of the decline of agriculture. This act alone was responsible for a loss to farmers of over \$30,000,000,000 and to country merchants of another estimated eighteen billion. This loss in capital investment of farmers, with the increased freight rates, has made recovery impossible. Added to these two causes of agricultural distress, we now have the acute depression which has thrown 8,000,000 men out of work so that they can not buy the farmer's products. The machinery of business distribution and trade has broken down. Farmers and workers are willing and able to produce, but consumers have no money with which to buy, and they will have none unless the Government itself comes to their aid. Private enterprise having fallen down on the job, the Government must act.

LESSENED BUYING POWER OF LABOR

In 1930 the aggregate pay roll of all persons engaged in gainful occupation was \$9,000,000,000 less than in 1929. In 1931 this same pay roll was about \$12,000,000,000 less than in 1929, and it is estimated that the total earnings for all workers in 1932, the present year, will fall at least \$15,000,000,000 under the peak year of employment, 1929. This means that the purchasing power of the country by reason of unemployment has been reduced from 20 per cent to 30 per cent a year. It is not surprising, therefore, that farmers can not get a price for their products, or that merchants are unable to sell their goods. It is not overproduction but underconsumption from which we are suffering. The loss in wages of unemployed workers amounts to more money each year of the depression than the total market value of all crops raised.

PRICE OF FARM PRODUCTS MUST BE STABILIZED

It is becoming increasingly evident that something must be done to stabilize the price of farm products. It is now just about 12 years since I introduced in Congress the first bill for this purpose. I have not changed my views as to the need for that legislation, and had it been enacted I am confident that agriculture would have escaped many of the ills from which it has suffered. During the last 10 years, even though prices have at times been higher than before the World War, agriculture has not been prosperous. The better prices have been more than offset by increases in the costs of planting, machinery, taxes, interest on investment, and so forth. Farm mortgages have grown, farmers have had to draw on their capital investment for operating expenses, and at a time when, for the most part, money could be had only at high rates of interest. From 1922 to 1931, inclusive, farmers lost heavily, as will be seen from the following table compiled from data furnished by Crops and Markets of the Department of Agriculture. The figures give the cost of production for the average wheat farmer of the United States during the past 10 years. These cost prices are obtained from reports of thousands of farmers all over the United States, and include number of acres cultivated, yield per acre, cost of planting, cultivation, harvesting, marketing, fertilizers if any, seed, land rent, labor, and all other miscellaneous expenses. The estimated average price per bushel received by producers is taken from the reported cash sales of all wheat sold on the six leading terminal markets of the United States. Of course, the actual price received by the farmer is well below this average price, as the cost of freight to the terminal market must be deducted. The table is as follows:

1922 cost of wheat production, \$1.23 per bushel; price sold for, 98 cents; loss, 25 cents per bushel.
1923 cost of wheat production, \$1.24 per bushel; price sold for, 92 cents; loss, 32 cents per bushel.
1924 cost of wheat production, \$1.22 per bushel; price sold for, \$1.23; gain, 6 cents per bushel.
1925 cost of wheat production, \$1.32 per bushel; price sold for, \$1.46; gain, 14 cents per bushel.
1926 cost of wheat production, \$1.12 per bushel; price sold for, \$1.24; gain, 12 cents per bushel.
1927 cost of wheat production, \$1.18 per bushel; price sold for, \$1.21; gain, 3 cents per bushel.
1928 cost of wheat production, \$1.24 per bushel; price sold for, \$1.01; loss, 23 cents per bushel.
1929 cost of wheat production, \$1.24 per bushel; price sold for, \$1.05; loss, 19 cents per bushel.
1930 cost of wheat production, \$1.09 per bushel; price sold for, 67 cents; loss, 42 cents per bushel.
1931 cost of wheat production, \$1.04 per bushel; price sold for 64 cents; loss, 40 cents per bushel.

It is apparent from a cursory study of this table why farm mortgages have been greatly increased in recent years. Wheat raisers on the average throughout the country have been losing money, though producing the most necessary article of diet. In certain marginal sections the loss per bushel is even greater than the tables disclose. This is especially true of my own State, North Dakota. The same general results of production and loss are similarly true in the case of other basic crops, such as corn, cotton, fruits, and livestock.

It is a self-evident fact that farmers can not go on indefinitely producing crops at a loss. There must come a time when they can not proceed any farther. That time has about arrived. This spring the farmers of the country from necessity have been forced to borrow nearly \$100,000,000 from the Federal Government for planting the present year's crop. Such conditions will continue from year to year unless some means is found that will give them a price equal to the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. What a striking indictment this is for a great industry, although producing sufficient to supply the needs of the Nation yet unable to save enough to provide for the next year's seeding.

COOPERATION AMONG FARMERS

For nearly 30 years a sincere effort has been made to organize farmers in order that marketing conditions might be improved. It has been thought that farmers through cooperative groups could control their own products, put them upon the markets in an orderly fashion and thus receive an increased price. Much work has been done and some limited success has been had along special lines and with a few commodities. But it has been fairly well demonstrated that farmers can not organize themselves to a sufficient extent to control the sale of the great basic crops. Some of us believed that the Farm Board act would solve this problem of cooperative organization. The board, however, almost wholly ignored this feature of the law and devoted its energies in an effort to stabilize wheat and cotton prices. To-day we are seemingly in a more hopeless condition than ever. So much so, that many of the great farm leaders, after devoting a lifetime to cooperative organization work, now say that farmers will not organize. The marketing problems of farmers can not be solved by cooperation without tremendous waste of energy and effort. The one other alternative is for the Government to get for farmers a price that will meet the cost of production, if the great industry of farming is to be saved from destruction.

HIGH COST OF DISTRIBUTION

Consumers generally are opposed to any increase in prices, feeling that the cost of living is high enough. This is quite true. If the farmer could only get the price that the consumer pays he would generally have cost of production. The cost of distribution is too high. It takes \$2 on the average to distribute one dollar's worth of farm products. What we must have is regulated distribution. Too often the central terminal markets are places of speculation rather than purely distributing centers.

During the World War we had a fixed price for wheat and many other products, under the direction and supervision of the Food Administrator. That was real cooperation on a large scale. The price of bread was very little higher with wheat at \$2 per bushel than it is now with wheat selling for less than 70 cents a bushel. When the present marketing act was passed many farmers expected to see similar results, even though the funds at the disposal of the Farm Board were known to be far from adequate. What should have been done was to give the board \$1,000,000,000 more than was appropriated. It should have been directed to buy the entire exportable surplus of all agricultural products at a cost-of-production price, put an embargo on all imports of like products, and raise all farm prices generally. That would have met the depression and would have prevented us from going any deeper into it. It is not too late to do this yet.

FARMERS SHOULD BE REFINANCED

The Frazier farm relief bill introduced in the Senate and now on the calendar, having been favorably reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, provides for the refinancing of existing farm indebtedness by the Federal Government at the rate of 1½ per cent interest and 1½ per cent on principal, payable on the amortization plan. The money to do this shall be provided by the issuing of Federal reserve notes secured by first mortgages on farms, in contrast to the present farm-loan plan of getting money by issuing and selling bonds. There is sufficient precedent for the Government to do this. During the World War it was necessary to increase the money in circulation due to the great emergency then existing. This was done by issuing Federal reserve notes secured by agricultural and commercial paper discounted through local reserve member banks. The total amount of money in circulation was thus more than doubled. A greater emergency than the Great War now faces the farmers and all other interests of our country to-day.

A further precedent may be found in the issuance of Treasury notes put into circulation following the Civil War. Some \$346,000,000 of these notes were issued then and have been doing service as money to the present day. Our Government is much better able to issue several billion dollars

of Treasury notes to-day than it was to issue the amount it did following the Civil War, when many of the State governments had broken down and little coin was on deposit for redemption purposes. At present Treasury experts have estimated that there is enough free gold on hand to maintain an increased currency issue of nearly \$4,000,000,000 without any impairment of the gold standard. It would not require more than \$2,000,000,000 of new issue to refund the entire farm-mortgage indebtedness. The work of refinancing could extend over a period of five years, the average life term of farm-mortgage loans, one-fifth being taken up annually. In fact, experience shows that in actual practice \$1 of currency can do the work of \$10 working as bank credit.

The mild inflation resulting from the operation of this law would stimulate prices and start the whole country, as well as agriculture, on the road to recovery. I have introduced in the House H. R. 7524, a companion bill to that offered by Senator FRAZIER. It awaits favorable action by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I believe that the passage of this legislation which will increase the money in circulation and place it in the hands of agriculture, representing as it does over one-half of our buying power, will revive the business life of the Nation, increase employment, and start the factory wheels moving.

THE REMEDY

In addition to enacting the legislation I have mentioned, to refinance farmers at low rates of interest, and strengthen the Federal marketing act, Congress should authorize a program of public works so that the idle can be given jobs at once. With this threefold program in operation, there is no doubt in my mind but that we shall soon be on the way to that prosperity which for so long has been "just around the corner"—a corner which we have been unable to reach because we have failed to take steps in the right direction.

Hand in hand with a program of constructive legislation should be coupled economy in Government. Congress is making a very earnest effort along this line, and although little mention of it has been made, the fact is that the House of Representatives has already cut approximately \$160,000,000 from the supply bills under the estimates submitted to us by the President and Budget Bureau. There is, unfortunately, much misrepresentation of the facts on Government expenditures, emanating, for the most part, from a powerful and selfish minority which, having grown enormously wealthy at the expense of the majority of our citizens, is now trying to escape bearing its proportionate share of the cost of Government by shifting it to the backs of the people.

No Government worthy of the name can be run without cost, and it is unavoidable that some mistakes will be made, but the fact is that aside from the increased costs due and incident to the war and which can not be escaped, the expense of the Federal Government has not grown out of proportion to the increase in our population. It is not so much the high cost of running the Government as the lack of revenue from inability of our people to pay that is troubling us.

TAXES

Taxpayers' associations in North Dakota and elsewhere are doing constructive work in the reduction of unnecessary expenditures, and lightening the burden for taxpayers. About 70 per cent of the taxes of the Nation goes for the running of State, county, and local governments. In North Dakota over 95 per cent is for these purposes. While our State contributes through its products vastly to the wealth of the Nation, and large incomes are made outside the State from handling and processing those products, yet our people pay directly a comparatively small amount in taxes to the Federal Government. Whereas the total tax in North Dakota for State, county, local government, and so forth, is about \$30,000,000 annually, the most recent report of the Treasury Department shows the total of Federal taxes collected to be \$365,232.84, or about 50 cents per person. It is not within the power of Congress to give any relief on State and local taxes. A grave responsibility does rest upon Congress and the administration, however, to adopt such poli-

cies as will make for the general welfare of the people, and to exercise wisdom and economy in spending public funds.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed last night the tax bill. In my judgment, there is nothing as important for the country as the speedy enactment of the tax bill to balance the Budget. [Applause.] There can be, in my judgment, no economic recovery or increased employment until the country and the world knows that the United States is going to collect as much revenue as it spends, and that it is on a sound economical basis and that the American dollar will be maintained. [Applause.]

This Congress, in my judgment, can do nothing more important than to expedite in every possible way the enactment of this tax bill into law.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent to take from the table the tax bill, disagree to all Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a bill, which the Clerk will report, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

H. R. 10236. An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Following the passage by the Senate of the tax bill last night, the gentleman has noted that the New York Stock Market began to climb upward this morning.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; and I was delighted.

Mr. BLANTON. In spite of some provisions in it which New York gamblers have been condemning.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Regardless of the market, which does not put men to work, may I ask if the House will have an opportunity to pass on the provisions in the House bill which provides for a stock-transfer tax?

Mr. CRISP. I will say to my friend from New York that I much prefer to go to conference unhampered. Of course, the conferees will be charged with the duty of trying to compose the differences existing between the two Houses. We can not inject new matter. The conferees must compromise; that is, give and take.

It is my hope that the conferees as speedily as possible can reach a complete agreement on everything and come in with a complete report. [Applause.] Therefore I can not promise that I am going to bring back to the House any amendment in that bill, because I hope the conferees may be able to adjust all matters, and I hope that we can get unanimous consent to place the bill in conference without any strings tied to the conferees to bring back any amendment. I may say to my friend that if this request is not agreed to, the Committee on Rules is coming in with a rule to put the bill into conference. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The House by a decisive vote put a tax on stock transfers, and the gentleman knows that. For one, I shall vote against any conference report that does not restore the House tax against transfers of stock on exchanges.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope that the gentleman will let the House have a vote on the House tax on stock transfers before he agrees to the Senate amendment which has eliminated such tax.

Mr. CRISP. I am not going to make any agreement myself to bring back any amendment.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CRISP, Mr. RAINEY, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. TREADWAY.

THE SOLDIERS' BONUS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have 98 names signed to the petition to discharge the Committee on Rules on the Patman bill for the payment of the soldiers' bonus. Two other Members have just signified their intention of signing, which brings it up to 100. Under the rules, in order to get a vote on June 13, we have to have 145 names signed to the petition by Friday of this week. Of course, every Member is entitled to his opinion either one way or the other on the matter of the soldiers' bonus, but that is not the particular aspect to which I refer at this time.

Since we have had a vote on the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment and on the beer bill, as well as the drainage bill—in fact, on every petition this session except this petition—it seems to me that the soldiers of the United States are going to look on those Members of Congress who are not in favor of giving them a vote on the Patman bill as being unfriendly to the soldiers of the country. [Cries of "Oh, no."]

Mr. BLANTON. Why not? If they will not sign up for the soldiers, why are they not unfriendly? Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONNERY. Certainly. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has always consistently favored the soldiers in their fight for the payment of the bonus.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is a proposition now on the Clerk's desk, which is the only thing that will help the soldiers. If 145 Members sign it, we will get a vote on paying the adjusted-service certificates. If you are friendly to them, go up and sign the petition. That only will give them a vote on it. You went up and signed for the beer bill.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman did not.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not, because I was not for beer saloons, and I am not for nullifying the eighteenth amendment, or violating the law, but I am for this proposition. I went and signed it promptly, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] signing it first, our colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] being the second signer, and I being next, being No. 3 on the petition.

Mr. CONNERY. I am giving you my opinion. I think you will find, when you get back to your districts, that the service men will feel that the Members of Congress who would not sign the petition, whether they are for or against the bill, in order to give the soldiers a vote, are unfriendly to the soldiers of the Republic.

EXEMPTING FROM THE QUOTA FATHERS AND MOTHERS OVER 60 YEARS OF AGE OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill, H. R. 8174, to exempt from the quota fathers and mothers over 60 years of age of United States citizens. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote upon the first amendment submitted by Mr. JENKINS, as reported to the House, which struck out all of lines 3 to 11, inclusive, on page 1. It is all of the section of the bill after the enacting clause, as the bill was reported by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, beginning in line 3, strike out all of section 1.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes, 76, noes, 27.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. This is an automatic call. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 85, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—240

Adkins	Driver	Kniffin	Sanders, Tex.
Allen	Eaton, Colo.	Kopp	Sandlin
Andresen	Eaton, N. J.	Lambertson	Selvig
Andrews, N. Y.	Elzey	Lanham	Shott
Arentz	Eslick	Lankford, Ga.	Shreve
Arnold	Fernandez	Lankford, Va.	Smith, Idaho
Ayres	Fiesinger	Larrabee	Smith, W. Va.
Bachmann	Finley	Leavitt	Snell
Bacon	Fish	Loofbourow	Snow
Barbour	Flannagan	Lovette	Sparks
Bland	Free	Lozier	Spence
Blanton	French	Luce	Stafford
Boehne	Fuller	Ludlow	Stalker
Boiton	Fulmer	McClintock, Ohio	Steagall
Bowman	Garber	McFadden	Strong, Kans.
Brand, Ga.	Garrett	McKeown	Strong, Pa.
Brand, Ohio	Gibson	McLaughlin	Stull
Briggs	Gilbert	McLeod	Sullivan, Pa.
Browning	Gillen	McMillan	Summers, Wash.
Brumm	Glover	McSwain	Sumners, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Goldsborough	Magrady	Swank
Butler	Goodwin	Major	Swanson
Byrns	Green	Maloney	Swick
Cable	Greenwood	Manlove	Swing
Campbell, Pa.	Griswold	Mapes	Taber
Canfield	Guyer	Martin, Mass.	Tarver
Cannon	Hadley	May	Taylor, Colo.
Carden	Haines	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter, Calif.	Hall, Ill.	Miller	Temple
Carter, Wyo.	Hardy	Milligan	Thatcher
Cartwright	Hare	Montet	Thomason
Cary	Hastings	Moore, Ky.	Thurston
Chindblom	Haugen	Morehead	Timberlake
Christopherson	Hawley	Mouser	Treadway
Clancy	Hill, Ala.	Nelson, Me.	Underhill
Clarke, N. Y.	Hill, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Underwood
Cochran, Mo.	Hoch	Nolan	Vinson, Ga.
Cole, Iowa	Hogg, Ind.	Norton, Nebr.	Vinson, Ky.
Collins	Hogg, W. Va.	Oliver, Ala.	Warren
Colton	Holaday	Overton	Wason
Cooper, Tenn.	Hollister	Parker, Ga.	Watson
Coyie	Holmes	Parker, N. Y.	Weeks
Crall	Hooper	Parks	Welch
Crisp	Hope	Parsons	West
Cross	Horr	Partridge	White
Crowe	Houston, Del.	Patman	Whitley
Culkin	Huddleston	Person	Whittington
Curry	James	Polk	Wigglesworth
Dallinger	Jeffers	Pratt, Ruth	Williams, Tex.
Darrow	Jenkins	Purnell	Williamson
Davenport	Johnson, Mo.	Ragon	Wilson
Davis	Johnson, Okla.	Rainey	Wingo
De Priest	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ramspeck	Wolcott
DeRouen	Johnson, Tex.	Rankin	Wolfenden
Dickinson	Johnson, Wash.	Rayburn	Wolverton
Dies	Jones	Reed, N. Y.	Wood, Ga.
Dominick	Kemp	Reilly	Woodruff
Doughton	Kendall	Rich	Woodrum
Dowell	Ketcham	Robinson	Wright
Doxey	Kinzer	Rogers, Mass.	Yates

NAYS—85

Almon	Connery	Hull, Morton D.	Pittenger
Amie	Connolly	Jacobsen	Prall
Auf der Heide	Cooke	Kading	Ransley
Bacharach	Corning	Kahn	Rudd
Bankhead	Cox	Karch	Sabath
Barton	Crosser	Keller	Sanders, N. Y.
Beam	Cullen	Kennedy	Schafer
Black	Delaney	Kleberg	Schneider
Bloom	Dickstein	Knutson	Schuetz
Bolleau	Dyer	Kunz	Seger
Boland	Evans, Mont.	LaGuardia	Shannon
Britten	Fishburne	Lindsay	Sinclair
Brunner	Fitzpatrick	Linthicum	Somers, N. Y.
Buchanan	Frear	Loneragan	Stewart
Burch	Gambrill	McCormack	Sullivan, N. Y.
Burdick	Gavagan	Mansfield	Sutphin
Campbell, Iowa	Granfield	Martin, Oreg.	Sweeney
Carley	Griffin	Mead	Tilson
Cavichia	Hall, Miss.	Millard	Tinkham
Celler	Harlan	Niedringhaus	
Cole, Md.	Hart	O'Connor	
Condon	Howard	Palmisano	

NOT VOTING—106

Abernethy	Beck	Burness	Chipfield
Aldrich	Beedy	Busby	Christgau
Allgood	Bohn	Chapman	Clague
Andrew, Mass.	Boylan	Chase	Clark, N. C.
Baldrige	Buckbee	Chavez	Cochran, Pa.

Collier	Goss	Lewis	Ramseyer
Cooper, Ohio	Gregory	Lichtenwalner	Reid, Ill.
Crowther	Hall, N. Dak.	McClintic, Okla.	Rogers, N. H.
Crump	Hancock, N. Y.	McDuffie	Romjue
Dieterich	Hancock, N. C.	McGugin	Seiberling
Disney	Hartley	McReynolds	Shallenberger
Douglas, Ariz.	Hess	Maas	Simmons
Douglass, Mass.	Hopkins	Mitchell	Sirovich
Doutrich	Hornor	Mobley	Smith, Va.
Drane	Hull, William E.	Montague	Stevenson
Drewry	Igoe	Moore, Ohio	Stokes
Englebright	Johnson, Ill.	Murphy	Tierney
Erk	Kelly, Ill.	Nelson, Wis.	Tucker
Estep	Kelly, Pa.	Norton, N. J.	Turpin
Evans, Calif.	Kerr	Oliver, N. Y.	Weaver
Foss	Kurtz	Owen	Williams, Mo.
Freeman	Kvale	Patterson	Withrow
Fulbright	Lambeth	Peavey	Wood, Ind.
Gasque	Lamneck	Perkins	Wyant
Gifford	Larsen	Pettengill	Yon
Gilchrist	Lea	Pou	
Golder	Lehlbach	Pratt, Harcourt J.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Wyant (for) with Mr. Tierney (against).
Mr. Reid of Illinois (for) with Mr. Sirovich (against).
Mr. Pratt (for) with Mr. Igoe (against).
Mr. Beedy (for) with Mrs. Norton (against).
Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Boylan (against).
Mr. Sieberling (for) with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. Buckbee (for) with Mr. Oliver of New York (against).
Mr. Cooper of Ohio (for) with Mr. Kelly of Illinois (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McClintic of Oklahoma with Mr. Clague.
Mr. Pou with Mr. Wood of Indiana.
Mr. Collier with Mr. Evans of California.
Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Hopkins.
Mr. Busby with Mr. Aldrich.
Mr. Dieterich with Mr. Chipfield.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Erk.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Tucker with Mr. Ramseyer.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Allgood with Mr. Moore of Ohio.
Mr. Stevenson with Mr. Bohn.
Mr. Larsen with Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Estep.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. Simmons.
Mr. Yon with Mr. Golder.
Mr. Douglas of Arizona with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Mobley with Mr. Foss.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Turpin.
Mr. Lichtenwalner with Mr. Hancock of New York.
Mr. Crump with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Chavez with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Kurtz.
Mrs. Owen with Mr. Christgau.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Goss.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. William E. Hull.
Mr. Drane with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Hall of North Dakota.
Mr. Williams of Missouri with Mr. Baldrige.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Shallenberger with Mr. McGugin.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Cochrane of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Hornor of West Virginia with Mr. Peavey.
Mr. Kvale with Mr. Chase.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the absence of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Eaton] on account of death in the family.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. DICKSTEIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. By special order of the House heretofore agreed to, bills on the Private Calendar will be considered

to-day. The Chair believes he expresses the sentiment of the entire membership of the House when he expresses the hope that every bill on the Private Calendar may be called before the end of the session, and those unobjected to passed and sent to the Senate. In order to do that there must be some cooperation among the membership themselves. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] called attention to a proceeding that might facilitate the calling of these bills. If gentlemen know that they intend to object to a bill, it is unnecessary to reserve the objection in order for some Member to make a speech showing the necessity of it when the other Member is certain to object. It seems to the Chair that the gentleman could extend his remarks in the Record to show his constituent why he could not get the bill passed. With that sort of an arrangement, if the membership would cooperate, the Chair thinks we might call 125 bills on the Private Calendar this afternoon.

The Chair makes that statement in the interest of the progress of this particular calendar.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT COMMISSION

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report from that Committee (H. Res. 241), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 241

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. J. Res. 41, a joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission and specifying the powers and duties thereof. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution from that committee (H. Res. 238), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 238

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 10048, a bill granting to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California certain public and reserved lands of the United States in the counties of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino, in the State of California, for an aqueduct, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GEORGE E. CASEY

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4868) for the relief of George E. Casey, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Postmaster General" and insert "Comptroller General of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

BASIL N. HENRY

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1029) for the relief of Basil N. Henry, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "pension, bounty, back pay, or allowances" and insert "compensation, retirement pay, back pay, pension, or other benefit."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

JEANIE G. LYLES

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1414, for the relief of Jeanie G. Lyles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill is in conflict with the ruling of the department and the President's financial program, and I object. It is so seldom that either the President or any of his departments recommend against taking money out of the Treasury that when they do report against a bill it behooves us to back them up and not let the bill pass. The Treasury now has a deficit all together of over \$3,000,000,000 since Mr. Hoover has been President, simply because he has been bringing an annual Budget to us every year asking that we appropriate for him and his departments the stupendous sum of \$4,000,000,000, when with sane economy he and his departments could have gotten along with less than \$3,000,000,000 annually during the first three years of his administration. For the coming fiscal year he has asked us in his December Budget to appropriate approximately \$4,000,000,000, and our committee has already cut him down \$161,000,000 below the amounts he requested on the supply bills this House has already passed, and we are still cutting to the bone. We must cut governmental expenses and balance the Budget if we keep this Government out of bankruptcy, and we must do it even if we make some of our good colleagues mad at us for blocking their bills. Ultimately they will forgive us, for they will realize that we have merely performed our duty. I object to this bill.

JOHANA ARMSTRONG

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1553, for the relief of Johana Armstrong.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, from my examination of the report there was no fault on the part of the Government in causing this accident. The floor happened to be slippery by reason of the slush conditions resulting from snowfall in mild weather.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am reserving the right to object in order to give the author of the bill his inning.

Mr. KETCHAM. In response to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin, if the gentleman will look at the record he will find that Mrs. Armstrong, in whose behalf the claim is filed, was an old lady 76 years of age. In attempting to pass through the revolving doors of the post office at Niles, Mich., on December 23, 1929, in the rush of the Christmas mailing—the floor, as the gentleman said, being wet and slippery—she fell by reason of being struck by the door as it revolved. She suffered a broken hip and suffered greatly

for some weeks. The bill is for reimbursement of her hospital expenses. Neither she nor her family are able to care for them.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This was a very feeble old lady.

Mr. KETCHAM. Extremely so.

Mr. BLANTON. And it was the passing crowd that pushed her down. It was not the fault of the Government. It was the fault of the crowd pushing through the doors. The Government should not pay this sum of money when it is not at fault.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

DANIEL COAKLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1813, for the relief of Daniel Coakley.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

THOMAS J. ALLEN, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2064, for the relief of Thomas J. Allen, jr.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I will have to object, if we can not have an explanation of the bill. I object, Mr. Speaker.

RICHARD M. CUTTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2084, for the relief of Col. Richard M. Cutts, United States Marine Corps.

Mr. MOUSER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLTON. Under the rules under which we are operating is a Member going to have an opportunity to explain a bill?

The SPEAKER. None whatever, when the regular order is demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. What happened to Calendar No. 280?

The SPEAKER. That was objected to by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Regular order was demanded and the gentleman from Utah was not given an opportunity to explain his bill.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the Speaker permit the objection to be reserved to the bill (H. R. 2084)?

The SPEAKER. Not when the regular order is demanded. The regular order was demanded by the gentleman from New York. The Chair does not control the regular order. However, the Chair will state that the Speaker has the right, as a Member of the House, to demand the regular order if the Speaker wants to, but in this instance he did not.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I appreciate that.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK]. The Clerk will call the next bill.

CHARLES W. DWORACK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2296, for the relief of Charles W. Dworack.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is against the department's recommendation and I am forced to object.

It would cause money to be taken out of the depleted Treasury, and I am working hard to help balance the Budget. I object.

WILLIAM K. LOVETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3029, for the relief of William K. Lovett.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CAUGHMAN-KAMINER CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3460, for the relief of Caughman-Kaminer Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Caughman-Kaminer Co., of Lexington, S. C., the sum of \$198.87 for merchandise lost in transit.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 6 strike out the sign and figures "\$198.87" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figures "\$130.87."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

In line 7, after the word "transit," add the words "in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOUSER: On page 1, line 7, at the end of the bill, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the words "in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the author of this bill kindly give us the date when this property was lost in transit so that the date may be inserted in the bill in order to identify the transaction and thus prevent any further claim against the Government? The date showing when the goods were lost in transit should be included in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is better secured now than to put some specific date in the bill unless you are sure of its being correct.

Mr. MOUSER. Unless we are sure of the date, of course, it should not be included in the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BERYL ELLIOTT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3551, for the relief of Beryl Elliott.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to state that I was absent this morning when the roll call was taken. I was in conference at the White House. I did not know that a vote was being taken. Had I been present I would have voted for the Jenkins amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SOPHIA A. BEERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3561, for the relief of Sophia A. Beers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the amount carried in this bill will be reduced from \$13,720 which the gentleman from Oregon asked for in his bill to \$5,100 and that the usual attorneys' fee clause be included in the bill, I shall not object.

But the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] must agree for his bill to be reduced from \$13,720 to \$5,100, and he must be willing that the usual attorneys' fee clause be added to the bill.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to object.

EULA K. LEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3775, for the relief of Eula K. Lee.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DOUGLAS B. ESPY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3791, for the relief of Douglas B. Espy.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ROSAMOND B. McMANUS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4059, for the relief of Rosamond B. McManus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not propose to object, I want to suggest that we are not making any headway with this Private Calendar. Let us go along and do business. We have three days in which to consider the calendar, and we should not become snarled because some Member jumps up and objects.

Mr. BLANTON. Our friend from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] ought not to get mad just because some Member objected to his bill. That was the prerogative of our colleague to object, when he thought the bill should not pass. Some of these bills on this calendar are meritorious and ought to be passed, and to-day, to-morrow, and Friday will probably be the only days upon which they have any chance to pass. The gentleman from Oregon must not get sore, and make objections merely because he is peeved. That will not get him anywhere.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if this is a sample of the justice of this House, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that this bill be reduced to \$5,000 and the usual attorney fee amendment included in the bill, I shall not object. This bill as introduced seeks to take \$25,000 out of the Treasury. Before it passes the objection stage, I want it distinctly understood that it must be reduced to \$5,000. With that understanding, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM). The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of New York and Mr. MARTIN of Oregon objected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is futile for us to try to go on with this calendar if the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] is going to object to every bill just because he is mad. He ought to calm himself down and not get peeved just because some Member exercised his inalienable right to object to his bill. He ought to be a good sport and take his medicine, and go along with us and help to pass the good bills on this calendar; and some are good.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, painful as it is to object to a request of my beloved colleague, I object.

CHARLES HELLYER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4274, for the relief of Charles Hellyer.

Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. MARTIN of Oregon objected.

JOSE O. ENSLEW

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4405, for the relief of Jose O. Enslew.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask a question. I wonder if the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] is going to object to this bill just because

some one objected to his bill? If the gentleman will curb his temper and get back to normalcy, we will pass a lot of good bills to-day. There are some good bills on this calendar, but it is necessary for those of us who watch the calendar to object to the bad bills. I did not object to the gentleman's bill, and the gentleman ought to calm himself. He will accomplish more by it.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BUSCH-SULZER BROS. DIESEL ENGINE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5429, for the relief of Busch-Sulzer Bros. Diesel Engine Co.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries \$15,000, and I object. Such a bill appropriating \$15,000 should not be passed here by unanimous consent in a half minute of time. I object.

MILES THOMAS BARRETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5682, for the relief of Miles Thomas Barrett.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL] state the reason the Government should pay this small amount?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is compensation due to this soldier for service rendered from May 3, 1918, to August 19, 1918, when he did not draw any pay although serving in the Army.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. We can not transact any business, and what is the use of wasting the time of the House?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DYER) there were—ayes none, noes 125.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present, as evidenced by the vote just taken. We can not consider meritorious bills, so why waste the time of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he is out of order. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious that the House accomplish something on the calendar to-day. The committee has worked hard on these bills. I asked for the regular order when a reservation of objection was made on the theory that we would proceed faster if an objection were made instead of a reservation of objection.

However, noting the temper of the House, I do not think I will further insist on the regular order in reservations, having in mind only the getting of an explanation, and that they do not intend at the end of the explanation, whatever it is, to object. With that understanding, I will no longer insist on the regular order.

Mr. COLTON. In view of the gentleman's statement, will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return to the gentleman's bill?

Mr. COLLINS. I object to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] knows what the bill is

he has objected to merely because he is peeved. I do not believe that the gentleman can give the name of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. MOUSER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOUSER. As I understand it, this bill, H. R. 293, was passed without objection, and the RECORD so shows.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Oregon objected to the bill when it was called, and then afterwards withdrew his objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay Miles Thomas Barrett, of Bridgeville, Pa., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for his service in the United States Army as a sergeant in the Corps of Engineers for the period of May 3, 1918, to August 19, 1918, both dates inclusive, the sum of \$175: Provided, That his service in the United States Army during the period in question is hereby made honorable by virtue of the passage of this act.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen, if you want to get along with this calendar, we had better get down to business. There have been three days set aside for the Private Calendar—to-day, Thursday, and Friday. We have over 600 bills remaining on the Private Calendar for consideration. Most of you are interested in many of these claims.

The trouble started this afternoon when the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Claims, immediately asked for the regular order and refused to permit Members to discuss some of the bills that were apparently objectionable. The committee checking the Private Calendar on both sides of the House devote a lot of time every night in preparation and going over these bills on the calendar. They are not seeking to object to meritorious bills which are on the calendar but to properly consider them and do the right and proper thing. The gentleman from New York began by asking for the regular order, which prevented Members from discussing bills in which they were interested. If Members may not reserve an objection in order to have an explanation, we will not get very far with this calendar. We must understand that these men on both sides of the Chamber who are charged with the duty of checking these bills do not have all the information which the committee has, and many times they want to be informed on some of the facts when these bills are called. Many bills are passed after a reservation of objection has been withdrawn.

What ought to be done here to-day is to turn back to the first bill considered, No. 277, and give all of these Members a fair chance. Give them their day in court. Let us go back to the first bill called up to-day so that we can finish this calendar before adjournment of this session. That is the only way to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. That ought to be done.

Mr. McKEOWN. In view of the gentleman's statement we can go back to where we first started.

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes. I am making no criticism of anybody. As soon as this bill is completed, I shall make that request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 8, after the figures "\$175," insert the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, last session of Congress I introduced a resolution to appoint a special committee to draft a bill to be introduced designating a Government agency to consider private claim bills. No parliamentary body fritters away their time on private claims except the Congress of the United States. A board or a quasi-judicial body considers these bills in other countries and has the right to make payment out of funds appropriated for that purpose after a proper adjudication or decision has been made.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Excuse me for a moment, and then I shall yield. Some agency like the Comptroller General ought to have the right to settle outright claims up to \$500.

Mr. STAFFORD. One thousand dollars.

Mr. COLLINS. One thousand dollars would suit me. Then if the claim amounts to over \$1,000, the board or the Comptroller General should submit the findings to the Congress, and the Claims Committee should consider the bill, together with the findings, and make report to the Congress. The Claims Committee would have ample time to consider bills of consequence then. As it is now, it is impossible for the Claims Committee to pass on approximately 7,000 claim bills, the number introduced at this session of Congress. I have endeavored since I have been an objector to select for objection only those bills wholly without merit. I have tried to follow certain rules and have objected to bills that I thought ought not to be passed, but this position of objector is a position that ought not to be put on any Member of Congress. We ought not to expect a Member of this House to have to do this onerous and very unpopular work.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. MOUSER. Does the gentleman not think it should be the duty of the man who is on the committee on either side of the aisle in charge of the bills to urge those that he finds to be meritorious the same as to object to those that are not meritorious?

Mr. COLLINS. I do. We, however, should pass a resolution this session of Congress appointing a special committee to bring in a bill placing the duty of adjudication of private bills upon the Comptroller General, or some other body, and relieve ourselves of this task which at best is imperfectly done because of the large number of claim bills that must be considered.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In order to show the exact situation on claims against the Government, it should be added that the Court of Claims has jurisdiction over all matters based on contracts and upon strictly legal grounds.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no choice as to any agency to do the work, but I do think we ought to provide an agency.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS. And I shall reintroduce the resolution introduced by me during the last Congress.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I agree perfectly with the gentleman, but it should be said that these claims are all in the nature of claims against the Government which could not be allowed except as matters of grace.

Mr. COLLINS. No; that is not quite the case.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They are not based on any legal grounds to be considered by the Court of Claims.

Mr. BLANTON. Until we do work out a proper plan, every bad bill that passes here by unanimous consent throws the responsibility of passing that bad bill on the shoulders of every Member in Congress. As a Member of this House, that responsibility rests upon my shoulders, and I am responsible when I allow a bad bill to pass here by unanimous consent. For that reason I carefully investigate this Private Calendar so that I can be prepared to stop the bad bills. And when my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] objects to a bill, it is because he has investigated it and found it to be without merit.

Mr. COLLINS. That is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly surprised to observe the spectacle in the House to-day. Before I proceed I want to absolve the chairman of the Committee on Claims, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] from any improper motive in calling for the regular order. I believe that in the orderly consideration of the Private Calendar,

since several days have been set aside for the consideration of private claims bills, we should have a gentlemen's agreement to go through that calendar entirely without reservation of objection, and pass the bills to which there is no objection or reservation of objection. We can then commence the next day at the beginning of the calendar and reserve objections in the cases of bills which might need further explanation on the floor.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] apparently did not show the proper spirit, I am sorry to say. He is a fine gentleman and a good legislator. Of course, he is a new Member, but it is manifestly unfair for any Member of the Congress to arbitrarily object to the consideration of good bills where there is not a valid objection, just because some other Member of Congress has objected to his own bill. [Applause.]

Where would we get if every Member took that attitude?

Mr. MANLOVE. I will tell the gentleman where we would get. We would get some reasonable, sensible rule for the consideration of these bills that have been considered by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SCHAFER. I did not yield to the gentleman, but when the gentleman speaks of a reasonable, sensible rule, the gentleman must have a private claims bill on the calendar to-day.

Mr. MANLOVE. Yes; and that bill has been considered by such men as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER] and others, as fine jurists as ever were in this House.

Mr. SCHAFER. Oh, I understand that, but we must face the facts as we find them to-day. I have served on the Claims Committee for some time, and have worked until 1 o'clock in the morning on many occasions considering these claims bills, as chairman of a subcommittee. Some of them were contained in folders 6 inches thick. Under the operation of a rule, where one Member can object to the consideration of a bill, I think it is a ridiculous position for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANLOVE] to defend the position that the House found itself in to-day.

Mr. MANLOVE. I do not defend any such position as that; but I do state that after the committee has considered these bills and has studied them and has looked into the evidence it is a ridiculous position for any one Member to have the power to come here and thwart the purpose of that committee—1 Member out of 435.

Mr. SCHAFER. I did not yield; but I hope the gentleman will assist me to get two more minutes so that I can finish what I wanted to say. The RECORD will show that I have consistently fought to liberalize the rule under which private claims bills are considered.

I agree with the gentleman; but it is a more ridiculous position to bring up a bill for consideration and let some Member use the rules of the House and his right in order to filibuster and take up the entire day in the House and prevent the consideration of any bills on the Private Calendar. Any one Member of this House, opposed to one of these bills, can filibuster and defeat any of these private claim bills when he desires to do so. When we are operating under this rule would it be fair to prevent the consideration of any of these bills because there might be a few bad bills on the calendar? I admit there are a few bad bills which have been reported by the Committee on Claims. I voted against them in committee. I intend to take care of them when we reach them on the calendar. When members of a standing committee with the press of business that we have in our office and on other committees and on the floor of the House have met and studied these bills as the members of the Claims Committee have, working late into the night, and at every regular meeting day, and then find that because some Member's bill was objected to on the floor of the House he objects to all bills on the calendar. I say that it is a sorry spectacle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are just stopping the consideration of bills by a lot of talk.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object to the gentleman from Wisconsin asking for two additional minutes, and I shall not object to the gentleman from Oregon, whose name has been mentioned, asking for time, but after that I shall object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] seems to be fearful that we are wasting time. His position, asking for an adjournment and the wasting of an entire legislative day, is just as ridiculous and perhaps more ridiculous than the position taken by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I was surprised to find some of the Members who have bills on the calendar rising and voting to adjourn a few moments ago. I could call off some names of those who have private claim bills on the calendar from the Claims Committee reported out by me as a subcommittee. Some of those gentlemen are authors of bills which have caused me as a subcommittee of the Committee on Claims to spend four or five hours late at night studying their merits so I could make a recommendation to the full committee and the full committee recommend the bill and place it on the calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I do not intend to have some of the Members who are badgering the members of the Claims Committee in the corridor and on the floor day in and day out, asking them to report their bills so they can come up on the floor of the House, act like demagogues and facetiously object to bills or move to adjourn because their own bills are objected to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM: Page 1, line 8, strike out the proviso.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That his service in the United States Army during the period in question is hereby made honorable by virtue of the passage of this act.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. He was rendering honorable service at the time he was discharged.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not know whether he was or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. The record shows that fact, if the gentleman will examine the record.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then this proviso is not needed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. But the man has not an honorable discharge now from one of the services.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that no legislation by Congress can or should affect the action of an administrative department, and particularly of the administration of the Army with reference to a discharge.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman understand the circumstances of this case?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say I understand them perfectly, and if the gentleman will allow me to proceed for a moment I think I will make it perfectly clear.

I refuse to yield further.

In legislation which we pass granting pensions to persons not honorably discharged this is the kind of proviso we usually include:

Provided that in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers such ex-service man shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States.

But we never by legislative enactment declare a man's service to be made honorable by virtue of the passage of the act.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; not now.

Whether a man's service in the Army has been honorable or not is determined by his record in the Army, and the Congress of the United States can not determine that his service was honorable, or that he was or should have been honorably discharged.

If the gentleman believes the proviso in the bill in some way may affect the payment awarded by the bill, then I suggest that instead of the proviso which is in the bill he substitute the proviso I have suggested.

Mr. BLANTON. Offer it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And I will ask leave to offer it as a substitute.

Mr. BLANTON. Good; do that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This is the substitute I offer:

That in the administration of any law conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers the aforesaid Miles Thomas Barrett shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. He is not asking for a benefit; he is asking for wages earned during his service overseas. He is not asking for a pension.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman apparently misapprehends my purpose. The first part of the bill provides for payment. I am not attacking that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. He has an honorable discharge from one of the services given to him at the time he was discharged. The gentleman does not understand the circumstances of the case.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think I do, but the proviso is not proper and does not improve the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I do; and I offer a substitute for the proviso now in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the former amendment will be withdrawn and the gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM: Strike out the proviso beginning in line 8, down to and including line 11, on page 1, and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, the said Miles Thomas Barrett shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. MOUSER. In this instance I think the gentleman's amendment is correct so far as clearing this man's military

record is concerned, but has this Congress up to this time corrected dishonorable discharges of World War veterans, and are we not setting a precedent in this case which will be followed in many thousand cases to come hereafter?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman that my first amendment was to strike out the proviso in the bill, and I think that would be the best action to take. I do not think the proviso is necessary. The first part of the bill gives this man the amount of money which he claims for his services, but I repeat that the Congress of the United States can not declare by an enactment or by a law that the service of any soldier has been honorable during any particular period. The Congress of the United States knows nothing about that. That is a matter of record in the War Department and we can not declare it here simply by dictum. I am perfectly willing to stand by my original amendment to strike out the proviso. That is not going to hurt the case, because the man gets his full amount. However, since the soldier rendered full and honorable service in the Navy, from which he did receive an honorable discharge, I do not believe this case need establish a dangerous precedent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Speaker, this is a peculiar bill. It is very objectionable if the proviso is going to remain in the bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] is entirely correct, that we can not and do not legislate as to the military record of any soldier or officer. We merely provide in all this legislation that so far as pensions are concerned so-and-so shall be considered to have been honorably discharged. We can not by legislative enactment change the military record of any soldier as carried in the War Department. All this bill seeks to do is to pay this soldier some back pay. It is rather passing strange that the Committee on Claims did not ask for a report on this bill from the War Department. It is one of the few bills on which there is no report, and if a report had been called for we would not have gotten into the impasse we are now in. The sensible thing to do is to either adopt the proposed substitute, which is harmless, or else strike out the proviso. I will raise the question of no quorum if this proviso is included in this bill, because never in the history of Congress have we legislated as to the record of any soldier.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. I am not disposed to refuse to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, but I do not think the gentleman understands the circumstances surrounding the case. This veteran is not asking that his military record be made honorable. He is asking for pay for honorable service. He was in the Spanish-American War forces and received an honorable discharge in 1910. When we entered the World War he enlisted in the Marines August 27, 1917, for the duration of the war, with the understanding that he would be sent to France with the first detachment going across. He waited for seven months and when the opportunity was not forthcoming he asked for and was granted three days' leave of absence from his post. He went to San Antonio, Tex., in civilian clothes and enlisted in the Army, with the understanding that he would be sent overseas. That was in May, 1918, and in June, 1918, he was overseas. Soon after his arrival overseas he wrote a letter through channels notifying the Marine Corps of his whereabouts. The Marine Corps claimed jurisdiction over him on August 4, 1918. He was then on the front lines. After proper investigation he was restored to duty and given an honorable discharge from the Marine Corps August 13, 1919. He received the croix de guerre and a citation by General Pershing. He did not receive any pay from May, 1918, until August, 1918, while in the Army. He is not seeking to have his military record corrected. His record speaks for itself. However, he did not receive any pay during the time I have mentioned and he was not paid by the War Department because they did not recognize his service, and being considered absent without leave from the marines

he did not receive any compensation for the period referred to.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Why does the gentleman provide in the bill then that he shall be considered as having been honorably discharged? It seems to me that is not necessary.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Because he did not get any pay or his discharge at the time he left his post with the marines and the marines took charge of him in August, 1918.

Mr. DYER. This is not the way to grant an honorable discharge to a soldier.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. He has an honorable discharge from the Marine Corps. The general gave him an honorable discharge after he found out the circumstances and gave him a letter of commendation. However, his record is not clear in the War Department, although he rendered meritorious service while in the Army, and it is sought to make this service honorable and not to correct or change a record already established.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My amendment makes it clear in the matter of receiving pay and allowances.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. He does not object to an honorable discharge; however, he does not need an honorable discharge from the Army to accomplish the purpose of the bill and entitle him to pay for services rendered to the Government.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This will protect him so far as his Army service is concerned, and the gentleman has said that he never was properly discharged from the Army.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. No; but he got a proper discharge from the Marine Corps.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This provision will protect him and also protect the Government.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. In this case I am more solicitous about the individual than the Government, for the soldier, prompted by patriotic motives and a desire to do some real fighting, transferred himself from one branch of the service to another without the usual formalities.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is a proper one. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL] inadvertently referred to this man's first service as in the Spanish-American War. The gentleman undoubtedly will correct that when he reviews his remarks.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I did not get the gentleman's statement about the Spanish-American War.

Mr. MOUSER. The gentleman inadvertently stated in his remarks that this man's first enlistment, concerning which the dishonorable discharge related, was during the Spanish-American War.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. No; the gentleman misunderstood me. I said he was a Spanish-American War veteran and then enlisted during the World War.

Mr. MOUSER. The first enlistment to which the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois refers relates to the World War.

This man enlisted during the World War with the understanding he was going to get overseas within a short period of time. He was disappointed in this and obtained a 73-hour furlough and enlisted elsewhere and did get overseas, where his service was not only honorable but distinguished and meritorious. There now comes a question as to whether or not, inasmuch as his name was dropped from the pay roll because of his being absent without leave or deserting, his name should be restored to the pay roll for the interim referred to, in order that he may receive \$175. Unless his discharge is made honorable, he can not legally draw \$175 from the Treasury of the United States, and therefore the gentleman from Illinois, in a spirit of helpfulness, offers an amendment to clarify the record so that this man can legally draw this \$175.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOUSER. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I had a somewhat similar case where an American enlisted in the Canadian Army, after deserting our Army, and when he came back he was given promotion and General McCain wrote a letter to the commanding officer at Camp Meade and told him that this soldier would return there and that there would be an honorable discharge waiting there for him.

Mr. MOUSER. I am trying to help the gentleman—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I do not need any help. This case will stand on its own merits.

Mr. BLANTON. With the Chindblom amendment adopted, this man gets his pay and gets his status fixed properly.

Mr. MOUSER. Not only that, but it removes a blot from his record.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I am not opposing the amendment. I am willing to accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the confusion that happened earlier in the afternoon, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 277 and call the bills following in order that every Member may have a fair and honest chance and so that we may handle the calendar in the proper way.

Mr. PARKS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

LAWRENCE A. JETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5793, for the relief of Lawrence A. Jett.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, for reasons previously stated in reference to similar bills I object.

A. L. MARSHALL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6003, for the relief of A. L. Marshall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to A. L. Marshall, of Ruleville, Miss., which said sum was paid by him on May 12, 1930, to the United States marshal, and which sum was covered into the United States Treasury on June 26, 1930, by reason of the forfeiture of the appearance bond of Ben Davis, alias Jack Avent, charged with the violation of the national prohibition act, on which appearance bond the said A. L. Marshall was a surety, and the said A. L. Marshall having subsequently, on the 9th day of February, 1931, brought the said Ben Davis, alias Jack Avent, into open court, whereupon he, the said Ben Davis, alias Jack Avent, entered a plea of guilty and was sentenced to serve a term of six months in the jail of Coahoma County, Miss., by the Delta Division of the Northern District of the United States District Court of the State of Mississippi.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 277.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BACHMANN. Reserving the right to object, I made the same request, and then to follow right through the calendar, but some Member objected.

Mr. COLLINS. I object.

SAM ECHOLS

The Clerk read the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 6855, for the relief of Sam Echols.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted to pay Sam Echols, the father of George W. Echols, deceased, the sum of \$7.14 due and unpaid the said George W. Echols for services rendered by him as postal clerk in the Railway Mail Service.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the figures "\$7.14," insert "in full payment of all claims against the Government of the United States."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I suggest to the gentleman from Nevada that his amendment would more properly come after the word "Echols" in line 5.

Mr. ARENTZ. I accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin and modify my amendment in that respect. The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

WILLIAM R. NOLAN

The Clerk read the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 7656, for the relief of William R. Nolan.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Reserving the right to object, I would like an explanation of this proposition.

Mr. MOUSER. Let me say to the gentleman that the War Department recommends the passage of this bill. The man was injured in an airplane accident, and the payment was disallowed simply because of a technical construction of the law.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement of all claims against the Government, the sum of \$613.75 to William R. Nolan for pay and allowance for the period from January 29, 1926, to April 14, 1926, the same being the pay and allowance of his rank during the period that he was receiving treatment from a specialist as a result of an accident in line of duty.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 1, line 8, after the figures "1926," strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "And also for any disbursements and expenses incurred by reason of an injury incurred in the line of duty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

THOMAS J. ALLEN, JR.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 280.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I objected to that bill, and the regular order was demanded without giving the gentleman any chance to explain the bill. I hope the request of the gentleman from Arkansas will be granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas J. Allen, jr., the sum of \$2,183.50 for the total damage of his personal effects by vandals while superintendent of the Hawaii National Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, when I was interrupted by a demand for the regular order to obtain some information, as I had examined the report rather carefully, this money is to reimburse this officer of the Government by reason of damage to personal property, caused, it is assumed, by bandits or vandals while he was away from home. I would like to inquire whether the Government has ever recognized similar obligations?

Mr. COLTON. I can not cite the gentleman to a precedent, but the department writes such a favorable report in regard to this measure that I feel sure it is not new in principle. I may say that a man was indicted for this offense, but was not convicted. There is no doubt that this deed was done to take revenge against the Government, or at least

the administration of national parks. Mr. Allen is a very high-grade gentleman and would not ask an unreasonable thing.

Mr. STAFFORD. It seems to me that this man suffered injury by reason of the office that he held.

Mr. COLTON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Therefore, the Government should bear the burden attached, just as if a prohibition officer were injured in the performance of his duty. I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I object.

CHARLES W. DWORACK

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 282, H. R. 2296, for the relief of Charles W. Dworack.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. If it is clearly understood that this bill is to be reduced by an amendment from \$10,000 to \$2,500 and some other safeguarding amendments are added, I shall not object.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Speaker, I must object unless the gentleman amends his request by asking to return to Calendar No. 277, and the consideration of all bills from that point on down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

JEANIE G. LYLES

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 277 and those cases that in the turmoil had no opportunity given for hearing, and that we proceed and give them a hearing on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I feel compelled to object because of the attitude of the author of the bill on Calendar No. 277, who objected to returning to another number, unless there was coupled with the unanimous-consent request a return to his bill. However, in the interest of orderly procedure I shall not object. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will not object to bills or to the return to bills passed over simply because their individual bill is involved and we do not return to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands the gentleman's request to be to return to Calendar No. 277 and to call the bills from there on down.

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That have been objected to?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, are we going to consider again all of the bills that have been considered this morning?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair so understands the gentleman's request.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Calendar No. 290 was called when I was unavoidably detained from the House this morning. I would like to make some explanation of it.

Mr. BACHMANN. If the request goes through, that bill will be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the bills, beginning with Calendar No. 277.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1414) for the relief of Jeanie G. Lyles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman agree to have it amended to reduce the amount from \$10,000 to \$2,500?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will be patient with me while I explain that this bill is for the relief of the mother of Lieutenant Lyles, the lieutenant having died in 1903. He was one of the outstanding heroes of the Philippine Insurrection and fought valiantly. In 1902, he invented a frame for the purpose of carrying rapid-fire guns, which was adopted and used by the Government, and has been used by the Government ever since. Up until 1911 over 3,000 of those appliances were in use by the Army of the United States, and from that time on their use has been most extensive. In 1912, a bill was introduced in this Congress to pay Mrs. Lyles the sum of \$2,500. After full consideration of the bill it was set aside with a favorable recommendation by the Committee of the Whole House for the payment to her of \$2,000. If I had the time I could draw attention to a colloquy which occurred at the time it was under consideration in 1912, which shows plainly and unmistakably that the department had agreed to pay to the mother of this deceased officer, in lieu of his taking out a patent, the sum of, I think, 10 per cent royalty, though I may be mistaken about the amount. However, the agreement with the Government was unmistakable. Mr. Rucker was then representing one of the districts from Colorado. Mrs. Lyles was at that time a resident of Colorado and has since moved to Maryland. That agreement showed unmistakably that there was a contract with the Government by which he was to be paid a certain royalty on the use of these appliances, and I have in my files a letter of about a year ago from Assistant Secretary Payne to the effect that \$2,500 is considered a reasonable sum to be paid to this widow.

I can read that letter if it will be of any interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not established law that when an officer invents anything while in the service of the Government, that invention goes to the benefit of the Government?

Mr. GAMBRILL. That may be the law, but there was nothing to prevent this lieutenant from taking out a patent on this invention.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is established law that if any employee invents a device during his employment it belongs to the employer.

Mr. GAMBRILL. May I just read this letter for the benefit of the House?

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I yield.

Mr. MOUSER. The Government most certainly is under a moral obligation to pay this man for the use of his idea.

Mr. GAMBRILL. There is no question about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me further in connection with the moral side of it?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The fact is there are hundreds of employees who give their brains in inventions who make no claim whatsoever on the Government.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Secretary Payne wrote me on July 11, 1930—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBRILL. The Assistant Secretary of War wrote me on July 11, 1930:

The file discloses correspondence in which the adoption and use of Lieutenant Lyles' invention is frankly admitted, and the opin-

ion expressed that the sum of \$2,500 would represent fair compensation for the entire use of the invention made by the War Department, such figure being computed as 10 per cent royalty upon the cost of manufacture of all pack saddles and frames, made or contemplated during the period of 17 years.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I do not know of any reason why the order of Colonel Rucker should not be in the report, if he ever ordered Lieutenant Lyles to make one or a dozen of these pack saddles. To adapt an idea which has been used for years and years in the West for pack saddles and try to claim it as a new invention, is almost preposterous. Pack frames have been used from time immemorial for packing in the West. If the Government wishes to give this lady \$2,500 because her husband died, that is another proposition, but to give her \$2,500 as a matter of right because this man adapted the idea of using a pack saddle is preposterous. I object, Mr. Speaker.

JOHANA ARMSTRONG

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1553, for the relief of Johana Armstrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the author of this bill had his inning, and I objected, and I will object again.

DANIEL COAKLEY

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1813, for the relief of Daniel Coakley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that objection has been made to-day to the consideration of this bill H. R. 1813, for the relief of Daniel Coakley. The objection seems to be based on the fact that the injury received by this man occurred before the enactment, in 1916, of the United States employees' compensation act. A single objection is sufficient to prevent present consideration. I am wondering if those who are inclined to make objection to bills of this character will pursue the same course as to all other similar measures on the Private Calendar. Of course, if any exceptions are made, the results are manifestly unfair to those whose relief bills are objected to. There should be no discrimination.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The facts involved in this case present a very strong appeal for equitable consideration. The official records show that on November 21, 1891, Daniel Coakley, white, then a boy about 13 years old, was employed as a messenger in the United States engineer work on the Louisville and Portland Canal at Louisville, Ky. This canal was and is a part of the Ohio River system. While so employed he suffered the loss of his right leg by having it crushed off beneath the wheels of a railroad car. The compensation act only permits the payment of compensation and the furnishing of medical treatment, including orthopedic appliances, for injuries sustained on and after September 7, 1916. A recent application made by Coakley to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, through the War Department, for furnishing an artificial limb, was disallowed for the reason that the commission has no appropriation for the furnishing of such appliances.

The Secretary of War, to whom was referred the identical measure, H. R. 4281, by the Committee on Claims for report in the last Congress, made a report thereon under date of February 26, 1930, setting forth the general facts as to the accident and injury. The same is included in the favorable report of the Committee on Claims touching the present measure, together with the formal report of the assistant engineer, Granville W. Shaw, engaged on the canal work; and the report of the chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The report of Assistant Engineer Shaw dated December 28, 1891, included by the Secretary of War in his report just mentioned, shows that Coakley, as messenger on the indicated governmental work was sent by his superiors to the Government warehouse near Eighteenth Street and the canal to procure there a key from Mr. Hughes, the Government receiver of materials. Coakley mounted a coal car attached to a westbound train on the track of the Louisville Cement Co. This company, I may say, was then engaged in that immediate section in the making of cement and operated its cars over local tracks for this purpose.

Employees of the canal work rode, from time to time, on these cars—which ran only a short distance along the line of the canal—with the knowledge and consent of the Louisville Cement Co. officials. Young Coakley therefore, in the discharge of his duty, and in line with custom, boarded the indicated car and, as shown by Engineer Shaw's report, rode as far as a switch or siding east of the bridge, where the eastbound train of cars was waiting. Mr. Hughes was on the eastbound train, and Coakley saw him at this siding point. In consequence Coakley sought to jump off from the car on which he was riding in order to reach Mr. Hughes to ask him for the indicated key. As Coakley thus sought to jump off the car of the westbound train, he slipped and fell with his right leg across the rail. One or more of the cars of the moving train passed over the limb, crushing it off just below the knee joint. Thereupon he was carried to a local hospital and his leg amputated just above the knee joint.

THE EQUITIES INVOLVED

The Secretary of War in his report, after reviewing the facts of Coakley's employment and the accident and injuries, states:

In view of the facts, clearly shown, that Coakley was injured while in the performance of his duty, and without willful misconduct on his part, it is my opinion that the claim is meritorious and that the relief sought by the bill should be granted.

The chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, on March 11, 1930, submitted to the Committee on Claims a report on the former bill (H. R. 4281), and in that report stated, in substance, as follows: That should the measure be enacted into law the commission would be authorized to receive Coakley's claim when filed, notwithstanding the fact that his injury would not otherwise come within its jurisdiction; and to consider such evidence as he might submit showing that had his injury occurred after September 7, 1916, he would be entitled to the benefits provided in section 4 of the compensation act, and to extend to him such benefits as he might thus be shown to be entitled to receive, from and after the date of the passage of the bill. The chairman of the commission further states that—

The injury in this case having occurred many years prior to the enactment of the law which it administers, the commission does not make any recommendation as to the advisability of the passage of the bill. If, however, the injury was incurred in the performance of duty, as appears to be the case, the equities would seem to be very strong for some future relief after 39 years of caring for himself.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that this appraisal of the equities involved, as made by the chairman of the commission, seems to be most just. This man's life was stunted and forever dwarfed by reason of this accident, sustained by him in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Federal Government. He was a poor boy and has gone through life maimed and crippled. He grew up without education. He has struggled hard for a bare existence. His earning power was seriously and permanently impaired by this youth-time accident. He has never had a fair chance, and he is now 54 years old and life's sun is sinking for him.

Had the compensation act been in force when his injuries were sustained he might have drawn throughout all these years something in the way of compensation from the Government he was serving. Should the fact that the humane legislation intended to cover such cases was not enacted until some years after the occurrence of the accident operate as a permanent bar to the relief which should have been

his from the date of the accident? He yet suffers. He is yet in need. He is yet altogether poor and destitute and tremendously handicapped. In recent years he has had to pass a portion of his time in the Home for the Aged and Infirm of the city of Louisville because he was without means and because he was unable to secure any character of employment. Should this great Government of ours be less humane, less charitable, less just, if you please, than any well-managed private corporation of the country dealing with similar situations? I had hoped that these considerations would appeal to the membership of the House sufficiently to overcome and prevent any objections of technical character to action on the bill.

This man has just this one life to live, and from his very youth he has been thus terribly burdened and handicapped. Literally speaking, he has been one of the "forgotten ones." Only the Congress, in the exercise of its plenary powers of kindness and justice, can afford him any measure of relief. The passage of this measure would enable him to go before the indicated commission and present his case upon its merits. The most that he might receive under such presentation would be small, for his earning power was and is very small. Lacking education, lacking physical wholeness, with age creeping on, and discouraged by his fate, for what can he hope, unless here, in this small way, we help him? He has not even been able to purchase a needed artificial limb because the law has not authorized it. Should this measure come up for future consideration in the House I hope that any Member inclined to object may conceive himself to be in this unfortunate man's place before entering an objection to its consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

THOMAS J. ALLEN, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 2064, for the relief of Thomas J. Allen, jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this bill is allowed to pass it makes the Government an insurer of the private property of every one of these employees.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. This is a different bill from any other here. I was inclined to oppose the bill when I first read the report. I made inquiry of the director of the national parks, and from him I received a short statement, which I will not read, but which I will put in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, May 13, 1932.

Hon. WILLIAM R. EATON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EATON: Referring to our conversation yesterday in regard to H. R. 2064, a bill for the relief of Thomas J. Allen, jr., introduced by Congressman DON B. COLTON, let me explain that the amount of this bill, viz, \$2,183.50, was submitted by Superintendent Allen at my request.

The circumstances of the case are as follows:

Mr. Allen was transferred from the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., where he was assistant superintendent, to the position of superintendent of Hawaii Park, which, as you know, is located on two islands, Hawaii and Maui. There had been trouble in the park due to the presence of what might be called a public enemy. This person, at that time unknown, had caused trouble of different kinds and a ranger's wife had been assaulted, apparently by the troublemaker. It was impossible to fasten the crime on the individual who committed it.

The then superintendent of the park, who had been detailed from the United States Geological Survey, largely because of the intolerable conditions existing due to the failure of law-enforcement officers to cooperate with the park, asked to be relieved. Mr. Allen was sent to Hawaii in his place. He had a new car and much new furniture. Shortly after arriving at the Hawaii National Park he left his headquarters in the Kilauea section, on the island of Hawaii, to visit the Haleakala section, on the island of Maui, to transact official business in Honolulu. While he was gone some one entered his home as well as his office. Papers were taken from the files of the office and in the superintendent's home acid was thrown over most of his furniture and the clothes of himself and his wife. With the exception of some furniture and the car, the property injured by the acid was totally destroyed or so seriously impaired that it had to be replaced.

A full report of the incident was made to the Washington office, and at my own suggestion Mr. Allen was asked to submit a detailed statement regarding his losses. His report was carefully reviewed by several officers of the National Park Service, including myself, and the final list as sent to the committee was made up here in the Washington office with my full approval. I feel that the claim is very reasonable. It does not represent by a considerable margin Superintendent Allen's actual loss. The report contains a full list of the articles damaged and the values. After talking with you to-day and giving full consideration to your own views on this claim, based on your careful analysis of it, I again reviewed the whole record with my associates and we could reach no other conclusion than that the claim was just and fair.

I might say also that the National Park Service has been very careful in the preparation of all claims to be submitted to Congress for consideration. Nothing that has come before us has received closer scrutiny than claims of this kind because we realize that abuses may creep into matters of this kind. A review of the statutes will assure you that only a few claims have been submitted and that these have been always fair and reasonable.

Mr. Allen is one of the most conscientious officers of the National Park Service. He is one of our ablest men. He was undoubtedly the victim of a revengeful act of an enemy of the Federal Government in Hawaii. There could have been no ground for personal animosity because Mr. Allen had just become superintendent of Hawaii National Park and had come from Colorado. He was not known to any person on the island of Hawaii before his arrival. I earnestly hope that you will see your way clear to support this bill. I can not help but feel that the failure of Congress to pass the bill would be an act of injustice to a loyal, faithful public servant.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, Director.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman further reserve his objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object. My colleague [Mr. GRISWOLD] has already objected two times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is too late. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas J. Allen, jr., the sum of \$2,183.50 for the total damage of his personal effects by vandals while superintendent of the Hawaii National Park.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think there should be an amendment at least setting out the date in the bill, so that the bill will show on its face when this happened. There is no date here. We do not know when this happened. We do not know how long ago it was or anything about it. I offer an amendment in line 8—

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLLINS. Is the bill about to be considered No. 280?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is.

Mr. COLLINS. I objected to the bill. My colleague [Mr. GRISWOLD] objected to the bill twice. I can not understand how it is being read.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair failed to hear either one of the gentlemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the House that the Chair put the question twice. Somebody said something, and the Chair put the question again, and nobody said anything. The gentleman got to his feet after the Chair had said there was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Where a Member rises in his seat and objects, as the gentleman from Mississippi did, is it right thereafter for the Chair again to say "Is there objection?" and when the Member does not hear the Chair, for the Chair to go on with the bill as if no objection had been made?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. He does not need any guardian on the floor of the House. If he does, he should not be here.

Mr. BLANTON. I am addressing the Chair. Everybody here heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] object.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold that a moment?

Mr. COLLINS. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all proceedings whereby this bill was considered be vacated, so that we can go back to the objection stage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will again report the bill H. R. 2064.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COL. RICHARD M. CUTTS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 2084, for the relief of Col. Richard M. Cutts, United States Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill because it carries an amount of \$14,198.08.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. MOUSER. The author of the bill has met my objection, which was the same as the gentleman's objection as to the amount of the claim for the property that was lost in the fire, that the property was overvalued.

Mr. BLANTON. The bill was introduced for \$15,679.08. The gentleman agreed that it be reduced to \$14,198.08.

Mr. MOUSER. The gentleman has agreed now to accept an amendment reducing the amount to \$6,000.

Mr. BLANTON. If he does that, I do not think this kind of a bill ought to be passed under unanimous consent. There seems to be entirely too much margin on it.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I make the unanimous-consent request that the gentleman from Indiana reserve his objection to No. 280.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Colorado that the bill has been passed on the calendar. The Clerk will call the next bill.

CHARLES W. DWORACK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2296, for the relief of Charles W. Dworack.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it understood that the gentleman accepts the proposed amendment to reduce this from \$10,000 to \$2,500?

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that as a matter of expediency rather than justice I shall accept the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have this bill marked for objection.

Mr. HARLAN. I shall be glad to explain the bill to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. The claimant in the bill, who was supposed to have been injured in 1922 at the time of the Roma accident, continued in the employ of the Government until 1929.

Mr. HARLAN. That is not the fact.

Mr. STAFFORD. He received salary from the Government except for three days. Now the gentleman is purposing to pay him \$2,500.

Mr. HARLAN. That is absolutely ridiculous. The man is an invalid and has been for years. As the gentleman will see from the record, Mr. Dworack was a very capable man, but the correspondence received shows the reasons for his resignation, and that he resigned very shortly after this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the author of the bill should have an opportunity to explain the bill if he takes issue with me.

I call the attention of the gentleman to the statement of the chairman of the Employees' Compensation Committee. It also appears that Dworack received full pay from the Government for all time lost on account of his injury with the exception of two and a half days. He made application for relief under the employees' compensation act.

Mr. HARLAN. Is the gentleman through?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am examining the report and waiting for some enlightening information from the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARLAN. This man, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, worked only a very short time after the accident. It is true he was paid for the time he was off in the hospital; but when he went back to work, he only worked a very short time and found himself unable to continue in his employment, and has not been employed for years. Prior to 1929 I believe he received a few intervals of very brief employment, but he has not done any real work since the accident.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Ohio give the information as to when he left the employ of the Government?

Mr. HARLAN. I have it here in the correspondence. He left within a very few months after he returned to his employment. He is in a state of complete shock. This bill passed the last House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House as to the reason for his not making application under the employees' compensation act? Apparently he did make application and it was rejected.

Mr. HARLAN. At the time he made the application he was still working for the Government, and at that time the Government had paid him for the loss that he had sustained; but this condition he is in now has developed since he left the Government employ.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am in error in my statement that he continued in the employment of the Government until 1929.

I am willing to accept the statements of the gentleman from Ohio that he only remained in the service a few days.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to Charles W. Dworack, who was permanently injured in the Roma disaster on February 12, 1922, at the Army supply base, Norfolk, Va., while in performance of duty.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the sign and figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figures "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated," insert "in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 5, after the word "duty," insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in

connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WILLIAM K. LOVETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3029, for the relief of William K. Lovett.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is understood that if the bill passes beyond the objection stage the amendment proposed by the committee is to be accepted, namely, that the amount carried in the bill is to be reduced to \$2,050.

Mr. MOUSER. At the proper time I have two amendments to offer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William K. Lovett, Wildwood, N. J., the sum of \$2,516.16 for loss of the motor sloop *Edith* and cargo while engaged in rendering assistance to the keeper and crew of the Holly Beach Life Saving Station at Cold Spring Inlet, N. J., on October 6, 1913.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 6, strike out the sign and figures "\$2,516.16" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,050 in full settlement against the Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the usual attorney's fee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOUSER: In line 10, after the figures "1913," insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BERYL ELLIOTT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3551, for the relief of Beryl Elliott.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SOPHIA A. BEERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3561, for the relief of Sophia A. Beers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it must first be understood that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] will agree to an amendment reducing the amount carried in the bill from \$13,720 to \$5,100, that the usual attorneys' fee amendment be included, and that this amount be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I will accept those amendments. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words about this bill? When a meek gentleman like myself starts to object—immediately my motives are impugned and I am jumped on with hobnailed shoes. Session after session I have seen bills objected to. I have been angry just as my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has been angry, because I know the labor that has been put on these bills. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] should not quarrel with me. I would like to see all of the bills passed which committees act on, because, as I say, I know the labor they put on them.

When I came here this afternoon I had this meritorious bill on the calendar. I am thoroughly familiar with it. However, I see it passed up like a white chip.

Mr. BLANTON. What kind of a chip?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. A blue chip. Fortunately, my colleague from Texas stated that the person involved here is a poor, starving woman, Sophia Beers. Her husband, who was a bright mechanic, during the war invented these pipe-bending machines. His resources were limited. After he had made this invention he went to the navy yard at Puget Sound and he asked them to have two of his machines put in the navy yard. The authorities consented that he should do this, and they were so placed. The efficiency of the machines were such that they ordered four more, making six in all. It took all the resources of that poor fellow to manufacture those six machines. The Government used the machines for one year. Evidence comes from the Secretary of the Navy that these were efficient machines and most valuable machines, and, as I say, they were used by the Navy Department in the navy yard at Puget Sound for one year. Then, when it came time to pay for them, this man ran up against some of this Government red tape which so many of the Members here condemn and rebel against, and which I rebel against. The Government said, "We can not pay for them because there was no advertisement for bids," and they refused to pay on these technical grounds. The man who invented these machines is dead and his poor widow has waited 10 years for her money. It is a most distressing case.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, assuming that the report is correct—

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I am familiar with it.

Mr. MOUSER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Under what authority did the foreman in the navy yard contract for these machines?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. That is just the point. He was one of those men who came in the Navy during the war. He was not familiar with the red tape and did not advertise for bids. Of course, he did not have the technical authority to order these machines and, as I say, he did not advertise for bids. It is merely a matter of red tape, and it is merely a thing which they overlooked. I am perfectly familiar with this case.

Mr. MOUSER. It goes beyond a mere matter of red tape and technicalities when the question of open and competitive bidding is concerned. That is why so much money was thrown away during the war. They did not follow that procedure. They did not give the public an opportunity to bid so that they might get the lowest and best bids. Will the gentleman accept an amendment reducing this amount to \$2,000?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Please do not ask me to do that.

Mr. MOUSER. I will be compelled to object unless the gentleman accepts such an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say to the author of the bill that I am confronted with the same difficulty which has presented itself to the gentleman from Ohio. These machines were used for one year and then the owner was given notice that the Government would have no further use for them. Why did not the owner then remove them?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. He did remove them.

Mr. STAFFORD. He did not. He left them.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. The poor man was broke. He had no resources and his wife has no resources. Why do you want to continue to deny her her just dues?

Mr. MOUSER. We feel sorry for the widow, but it is a question whether the Government of the United States has a legal liability or a moral obligation.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. It has both a legal and a moral obligation.

Mr. MOUSER. I can not see that the gentleman has satisfactorily explained that.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. The Government has had the obligation for 10 years.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman accept the amendment I have suggested?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Two thousand dollars?

Mr. MOUSER. Yes; just simply paying her on a moral obligation that amount for rent of these machines for nine months.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. How can the gentleman stand up there and look me in the face and make such a proposition?

Mr. MOUSER. There is no legal obligation involved here and the Government only used them nine months, and \$2,000 would certainly be a fair rental. It is not the fault of the Government that they negligently left the machines there and they disappeared.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman make it \$3,000?

Mr. MOUSER. I am not that kind of man. Will the gentleman accept the amendment? Two thousand dollars is a pretty good rental for nine months.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I shall have to accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the Chair may have the attention of the gentleman from Oregon, the Chair will call attention to the fact that a similar bill has passed the Senate and is now on the Speaker's table. Without objection, the Senate bill will be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Does the Senate bill carry the same amount?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; \$5,100.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sophia A. Beers, widow and the heirs at law of William H. Beers, deceased, the sum of \$5,100 in full compensation and settlement for all claims and demands of William H. Beers, deceased, growing out of, or arising from, the use, destruction, and loss of certain pipe-bending machines in the United States navy yard at Puget Sound, Wash.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments; in line 9, change the amount of \$5,100 to \$2,000, and at the end of the bill add the usual attorneys' fee provision.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOUSER: In line 7, strike out "\$5,100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000," and in line 11, after the word "Washington," insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

SENATE TAX BILL

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the revenue bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the meanest and most merciless of all Federal tax bills! This is a fair and not extravagant description of the Senate tax bill as sent to conference by the House this noon.

Over one-quarter of the \$1,121,000,000 of the total revenue provided for in the bill is assessed on one industry—the automobile industry.

On top of that we have the cool suggestion of the Speaker of the House, Mr. GARNER, proposing additional tens of millions of dollars upon the automobile industry in the form of gasoline taxes to pay the cost of over \$2,000,000,000 worth of bonds which are to be issued to finance his \$2,309,000,000 relief and unemployment bill.

With fine irony Speaker GARNER calls this cruel and ruinous additional tax on the automobile industry "mercy money."

The enemies of the automotive industry have always had great influence with Congress and with the administration, and they have dealt many underhanded blows to the automobile industry, but never have they been so successful and so destructive in their machinations as in the present annual revenue bill and in the Garner relief plan.

At last, by reactions of the terror and desperation which is menacing the country, the friends of the automotive industry in Congress have been powerless to get fair and adequate consideration for the key industry of the country. It is universally conceded in financial and business circles that the automobile industry had the finest opportunity to lead the country back to good times.

Rising to their responsibility, captains of the automobile industry have been risking their last dollar recently to bring back prosperity. They issued 217 new models for the annual automobile shows this past winter, which is illustrative of the daring and enterprise of the industry.

The automobile industry made its big gamble, only to be slapped down by a wildly desperate Congress, which apparently can not resist the attack of the enemies of the automobile industry.

This morning automobile men all over the United States were panic stricken and stood aghast at the cruel and unwarranted injuries that have been done to them in the revenue bill as it was sent to the House.

They saw their competitors in the transportation world triumphant and protected from ruinous sales taxes.

One has but to examine the bill to see how malevolent and malignant it is to the automotive industry.

The direct sales tax on automobiles, trucks, parts, and accessories has been raised from the 3, 2, and 1 per cent rates of the House bill to 3, 2, and 2 per cent.

A conservative estimate of this direct tax is \$55,000,000.

The Senate inserted an entirely new and vicious tax on tires and tubes, amounting to \$33,000,000 per year, in the form of a 4-cent-per-pound tax on rubber tire cases.

In the last hours of the bill in the Senate the automotive industry was struck another deadly blow in the form of a 1 cent per gallon tax on gasoline, which the Senate estimated at \$150,000,000 but which is much closer to \$200,000,000 per year, in my opinion, for the automobile industry alone used over 16,000,000,000 gallons of gasoline last year.

An extraordinary tax of 4 cents a gallon on lubricating oil is in the bill, and it is estimated this additional tax on the automobile industry will amount to \$35,000,000 per year.

This makes a total alone of \$273,000,000 per year.

But there are other unusual taxes in the bill, such as the import tax on gasoline and oil and copper, which undoubtedly bring the taxes in this bill alone on the automobile industry to over \$300,000,000 per year. The automotive industry is one of the biggest users of lumber and coal in the country and these additional tariff taxes will add to the burdens of the automobile industry.

Consider that the automobile is already the heaviest taxed of all commodities and is paying over \$1,000,000,000 per year now in State, county, city, village, and township taxes,

and any fair man will readily concede that this Federal revenue bill is just what I called it in my opening statement of these remarks—"The meanest and most merciless of all Federal tax bills" considered by the American Congress.

We friends of the automotive industry in the House will fight this bill as best we can in conference and we will fight to get a vote on some of these items on the floor of the House. Certainly the House conferees should insist that the Senate's 2 per cent tax on parts and accessories should be put back to the House rate of 1 per cent.

We are imploring the House conferees to kill the \$33,000,000 tax on tires and tubes.

The Federal gasoline tax is altogether too high, and that should be cut down. Certainly the Ways and Means Committee never should pass out the Garner relief plan, providing for additional hundreds of millions of dollars in gasoline and automotive taxes.

For many years I have insisted to the leaders of the automotive industry that they should not take this persecution of high, unfair, discriminatory, and exorbitant taxes at the hands of their servants and public officials.

In 1923 and 1924 I helped organize the automotive industry into one of the most powerful political machines ever developed by any industry.

My personal advice to the leaders has been that they should stand by their friends among the Congressmen and Senators in their primaries and elections, and I have always insisted that they should let the voters who have automobiles and who are in any way connected directly or indirectly with the automobile industry know who their friends are in Congress.

It follows as the night the day that they should also let the voters know who the bitter and unrelenting enemies of the automotive industry are in the House and Senate, in the State legislatures, and in the other political units of the Nation.

No group of men in the history of this country have ever shown such daring and gameness and enterprise as the men who are running the automobile industry in this country to-day.

It remains to be seen whether they will lie down like cravens and cowards in the face of this merciless attack and persecution embodied in the two great bills now before Congress—the \$1,121,000,000 revenue bill and the \$2,309,000,000 Garner relief bill.

The leaders of the automobile industry have always been reluctant to engage in politics, but only the blindest of them can now deny that they are submerged almost over their heads in politics through the schemes and manipulations of their enemies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD made to-day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EULA K. LEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3775, for the relief of Eula K. Lee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DOUGLAS B. ESPY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3791, for the relief of Douglas B. Espy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what obligation is upon an enlisted petty officer so far as insuring his property against fire is concerned.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MOUSER. I can not see any evidence in the report of negligence on the part of the Government. I think the amount is certainly excessive so far as the loss of clothing is concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ROSAMOND B. M'MANUS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4059, for the relief of Rosamond B. McManus.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, with the understanding that this bill is to be reduced to \$5,000 and with the proper safeguarding amendment adopted, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rosamond B. McManus the sum of \$25,000 in full settlement against the Government for the death of her husband, Howard McManus, who was killed by a Department of Commerce airplane on September 17, 1930, at Dixon, Ill.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 6, strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. At the end of the bill add the usual attorney's fee clause.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: In line 10, after the word "Illinois," insert a colon and the following:

"Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment. On page 1, line 7, before the word "against," insert "for all claims."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: In line 7, before the word "against," insert "for all claims."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHARLES HELLYER

The Clerk read the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 4274, for the relief of Charles Hellyer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will gladly do so. My objection is based on the fact that the injury occurred prior to the enactment of the employees' compensation act. It has been the consistent policy of this Congress to object to all claims of that character brought within the purview of that act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will relieve the gentleman from all responsibility in connection with the bill by saying that I have the sad duty to announce that the claimant is dead.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman that notwithstanding his sarcastic remarks, under the provisions of this bill, the widow, if he left any, would be entitled to the compensation. I object.

JOSE O. ENSLEW

The Clerk read the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 4405, for the relief of Jose O. Enslew.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. SOMERS of New York. When the gentleman objected before to this bill, I got the impression that he did so on the ground that this accident occurred on a narrow street, and it was impossible to have an accident there without the fault lying with the claimant. During the past summer I was on this street and noted the conditions there, and I can see how one might encounter an accident of that sort without any fault on his or her part. Knowing that condi-

tion, I was wondering if the gentleman would not reconsider his objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I based my objection a year ago, as well as to-day—and I wish to say that I have reexamined the report in the case, because I did not want to do any injustice to the claimant—because I believed that the claimant was at fault, that she virtually walked into the truck, and the eyewitnesses so testified, and that the truck was going at a reasonable speed. There is nothing in the record to show that the Government was at all at fault.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. This was a wet day, and the construction work of a new building had blocked the sidewalk, and this girl turned out, and when the automobile came down the street it struck her.

Mr. BACHMANN. How old is this little girl?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Oh, about 20. She is a stenographer, a brilliant girl, well educated, and a responsible person in every way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to say that I went so far as to examine all the affidavits, and the entire report and testimony, and I came to the conclusion the Government was in no way at fault. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER] was unavoidably called to the telephone at the time calendar No. 279 was called. It was objected to, and I think in fairness to the gentleman from Kentucky, owing to his unavoidable absence, that we should go back to that calendar number. I ask unanimous consent to return to calendar No. 279, in order that the gentleman from Kentucky may offer an explanation of that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection, provided it is subject to objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, we have gone over this calendar twice. There is no man in the House for whom I have a higher regard than I have for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER], but I think we ought to get along with the calendar. I object.

BUSCH-SULZER BROS. DIESEL ENGINE CO.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5429) for the relief of the Busch-Sulzer Bros. Diesel Engine Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I call attention to what the department says about this bill. I read from the report:

The claimant entered into the contract for the construction of the engines for the V boats with full knowledge that its orderly performance must depend upon appropriations to be made by the Congress. No general legislation has been effected for the payment of carrying charges in similar cases, except where the construction of vessels was suspended by reason of treaty limitations, and it is considered that it would establish a dangerous precedent to allow such charges on an isolated contract.

Further, the department says that the cost of the proposed legislation is \$38,007.74, and the bill itself carries \$15,273.60. By stopping this bill I save \$15,273.60, and ultimately I save the sum of \$38,007.74 for the Treasury, because the department says this legislation will cost the people that sum. In these strenuous times it is worth while to save \$38,007.74.

On the recommendation of the department, I object.

LAWRENCE A. JETT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5793) for the relief of Lawrence A. Jett.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

HOWARD EMMETT TALLMADGE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 964) for the relief of Howard Emmett Tallmadge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is a bill introduced by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]. The record shows that this man

was dismissed from the service because of bad conduct; that during his brief period of service he committed a number of serious offenses against naval discipline. In view of the President's position recently stated in his veto message to the House of the omnibus pension bill, of similar character, does the gentleman think that if this bill should be submitted to him it would escape a veto?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is different from the ones that the President vetoed. If the President should veto this meritorious bill, he could not defend his position. The facts indicate that this man received a discharge that was not honorable during his Spanish-American War service by reason of the fact that he talked a little rough to a noncommissioned superior officer. When the World War broke out he voluntarily enlisted and served from January 21, 1918, to March 13, 1919.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws Howard Emmett Tallmadge, formerly coal passer, United States Navy, shall hereafter be held to have been honorably discharged from services in the naval forces of the United States on October 13, 1902: *Provided*, That no pension, bounty, pay, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACHMANN: On page 1, in line 7, after the word "provided," strike out the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That no bounty, pension, back pay, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act."

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY DIXON LINEBARGER

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 2599, for the relief of Henry Dixon Linebarger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SANDERS]. I heard the evidence in this particular case. There was no offense involving moral turpitude. This man very shortly after his alleged desertion was found to be insane. It is my opinion that the man's desertion was undoubtedly due to his mental condition at the time. He has been confined in the hospital a good deal of the time since his discharge. I am convinced that he was mentally unbalanced at the time he absented himself.

Mr. MOUSER. And the gentleman considers his condition due to his mental condition?

Mr. COYLE. Entirely.

Mr. MOUSER. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged sailors, Henry Dixon Linebarger, who served as seaman, United States Navy, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States on January 22, 1919: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ARTHUR L. HACYKELL

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 3601, for the relief of Arthur L. Hacykell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill should not pass. The department says the disability did not occur in line of

service and that it will cost the Government approximately \$600 each year, and the department recommends against the bill. I think that sum of money should be saved each year.

Upon that recommendation, I object.

HARRY MANNING LEE

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 5595, for the relief of Harry Manning Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged sailors, Harry Manning Lee, who served as private, United States Marine Corps, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States on September 5, 1918: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 6000, for the relief of Austin L. Tierney.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. COYLE. This is another case where I listened to the testimony, and I feel convinced that in this particular case the man was insane at the time he absented himself. All the medical evidence seems to bear that out.

He is apparently a charge on some community, and it would seem that in view of his service it might not be unfair to let the Pension Office assume that charge.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in the Medical Office of the Navy Department to show that he had any mental disorder.

Mr. COYLE. The moment that mental disorders show he unquestionably would be discharged from the Navy. That is the reason it does not show on his record.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the gentleman take the position that when these mental disturbances demonstrate themselves 10 or 15 years afterwards, we are to go back and forget their unsocial attitude and reinstate these men as good soldiers and good sailors? Is that what the gentleman is trying to do by this series of bills?

Mr. COYLE. It does not seem so to me.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If it is called insanity, the elements were just as present then as they are to-day, and it is not recognized, as I understand it, as either a basis for damage or a basis for claim.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The department recommends against this bill, yet it says it will place no additional charge on the Treasury.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If the gentleman from Texas would read the next sentence—

It is probable that a Veterans' Administration charge will be involved now or in the future.

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman is sound in that statement. There undoubtedly will be a Veterans' Administration charge, but I submit that in all human probability that is the proper agency to take care of this man, because he has been insane practically from the time he was a deserter from the service.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. That is, if you call it insanity. Insanity is a defense every time a man commits murder or theft.

Mr. COYLE. If the gentleman will bear with me still further, this case was diagnosed as "psychosis, manic-depressive, origin not in line of duty, and not due to his own misconduct."

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the gentleman know what those words mean?

Mr. COYLE. I have seen them frequently.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the gentleman know what they mean?

Mr. COYLE. I have a general idea.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. And does the gentleman not join me in objecting to this bill?

Mr. COYLE. No.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I object, Mr. Speaker.

THOMAS T. GESSLER

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 2284, for the relief of Thomas T. Gessler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, this man enlisted in the Navy as he said he wanted to get better medical attention at the time, in his letter. He apparently was one of the border-line cases. His nervous system was suitable for ordinary life, but when he got into the Navy things just went to pieces. He was in the hospital 41 days of the 65 days that he was on sea duty. He went home to get treatment from his own doctors; and while there he was unable to get funds to get back, and he went to the naval-recruiting man, and he said he could not help him. Finally, his father borrowed enough money to get him back to his ship. He came back to the ship and surrendered himself and was charged with being away without leave, or deserting during war. He was sent to confinement, and it was discovered that he was physically unfit ever to return to the service, and they released him.

As shown by the report, the doctor who examined him during his confinement said:

His history shows that due to his hypochondriacal ideas he has been unable to work steadily, and he says he joined the Navy to get "doctored up."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MARY A. COX

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1174, for the relief of Mary A. Cox.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, the bill in its present form is not objectionable, except that it is not in the customary form in which we authorize these claims to be examined by the Compensation Commission.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has the gentleman any amendment to suggest?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Maryland will have no objection to the substitute I am about to propose, because it carries out virtually the same purpose, and I will withdraw the reservation of objection and offer an amendment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman understands, does he not, that no payment will commence until after the adjudication?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes. This is merely to grant authority to submit the claim to the Employees' Compensation Commission.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Mary A. Cox, who claims disability as a result of employment under the United States Shipping Board in 1917 and 1918. The United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to consider and act upon her claim, No. 112410, under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, as if her claim and notice had been filed within 60 days after said alleged disability.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Will the gentleman advise the date the injury occurred, so I may incorporate that in an amendment?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The woman was employed in August, 1917.

Mr. STAFFORD. When did the injury occur?

Mr. LINTHICUM. She says:

The muscles of my right arm would ache, and on February 14, 1918, when I first consulted my doctor, the fingers of my right hand were badly twitching. However, I did not think it would amount to anything but a passing cramp, and believed when they caught up with my work and just worked along normally it would pass.

She states that the serious trouble began about February, 1918.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it would be agreeable to describe it as an injury purporting to have occurred in 1918 and thereafter.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would the gentleman have any objection to saying "1917, 1918, and thereafter"?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will make it read "1917, 1918, or thereafter."

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to consider and determine the claim of Mary A. Cox for an injury purporting to have occurred some time in 1917, 1918, or thereafter, in the same manner and to the same extent as if said Mary A. Cox had made application for the benefits of said act within the 1-year period required by sections 17 and 20 thereof: *Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JOHN S. SHAW

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1778, for the relief of John S. Shaw.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

IRENE LUNGO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1861, for the relief of Irene Lungo.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SILAS B. LAWRENCE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2478, for the relief of Silas B. Lawrence.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to state to the author of the bill my objections. In the first place, this accident happened in 1897. I object because of the remoteness of the time of the accident in reference to the time this bill was introduced.

Secondly, I doubt very much whether this man when deputized by the United States marshal was actually in Federal service, in view of the reward of \$500 which had been offered for the apprehension of some alleged moonshiners, or that he was a Federal employee within the meaning and spirit of the law. It is quite evident that the posse went out more in view of the \$500 reward than they did for any act of Federal duty.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman misunderstands the situation.

Mr. MOUSER. He went out after the \$500 reward.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is mistaken as to the \$500 reward. The reward was offered by the Attorney General of the United States for the arrest of the bootleggers after they had shot two deputy marshals, Mr. Lawrence and another gentleman.

Mr. MOUSER. The reward was offered subsequent to Lawrence's injury?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Since the claim was investigated and reported upon I obtained a report from the Attorney General and also photostatic copies of all the proceedings that were taken by the Attorney General for the apprehension

of the murderers. They were apprehended later and punished. Some of them were hanged.

Mr. MOUSER. Was the reward paid?

Mr. MILLER. The reward was paid to other people.

Mr. MOUSER. This claimant did not participate in the reward, then?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOUSER. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not have this bill down for objection, but I notice there is no report from any of the departments, and it seems to me to be rather unfortunate that some of these bills are coming in without reports from departments.

Mr. MOUSER. I agree with that statement of the gentlemen. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the gentleman from Arkansas has just stated he has in his possession now photostatic copies of statements from the Attorney General, and if he will insert them in the RECORD that will make a complete report.

Mr. MILLER. I will be pleased to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have had difficulty in subscribing to this claim for the reason the injury occurred so long ago. This claim has not been presented to the Employees' Compensation Commission. The injury occurred in 1897. If we are to be consistent we must object to this claim as we have to others.

Mr. MILLER. I will state to the gentleman that in a discussion with the old gentleman himself I asked him why he had never made a claim. He made this statement to me:

I have never asked my Government for a dime for anything, but I have reached the point where I am totally disabled, and the loss of my arm is largely responsible for it, and if you feel like the Government should pay me anything for the injury I will appreciate it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What does the report of the Attorney General show, because I have been consistently objecting to these old claims, and we must stop some time having the Treasury used as a vehicle for passing out Christmas presents?

Mr. MILLER. The report of the Attorney General states:

Further reference is made to previous correspondence concerning your bill for the relief of one Silas B. Lawrence, who was injured on August 29, 1897, while a member of the United States marshal's posse in the eastern district of Arkansas.

There is inclosed herewith a copy of a letter from the United States marshal for that district, dated February 26, 1932, concerning this matter, and also copies of letters transmitted with his report.

A further search of the records of the department at Washington shows that there were received from the marshal two telegrams dated August 30, 1897, and also a report dated September 3, 1897. The latter shows the names of the deputies who were killed and also the statement that Cy. Lawrence was "shot in the arm" and that "his arm has since been amputated." Copies of the telegrams and report are also inclosed herewith.

Although these reports definitely establish that Mr. Lawrence was injured while serving as a member of the United States marshal's posse, on the date above mentioned, the department would prefer not to express any opinion, at this time at least, as to whether the bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the Government reimbursed these other officers who were injured or killed?

Mr. MILLER. I am not able to say, but they were officers of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes in order that the gentleman may continue his statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. If we have not recognized liability in these other cases, I do not think we should begin in this case.

Mr. MOUSER. May I suggest to the gentleman that this man might be excused for a lack of knowledge of the law as to the statute of limitations. Moreover, it appears from the position he occupies as a citizen that he could not have understood the technicalities of the law with reference to the statute of limitations, and I think he should be forgiven for laches upon his part. I certainly think the amount carried in the bill is not too high. I am rather

sympathetic with the gentleman's bill in view of his explanation.

Mr. MILLER. This man lived back in the mountains and could not know about the statute of limitations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,000 to Silas B. Lawrence as reimbursement for expenses actually incurred by him as a direct result of personal injuries received by him on August 29, 1897, while in the discharge of his duties as a member of a posse under the command of the United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas, and as full compensation for said injuries, the pain and suffering from the same, including loss of earnings and any permanent disability resulting from said injury.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. In line 10, strike out the word "western" and insert the word "eastern."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: In line 10, strike out the word "western" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eastern."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the usual attorney's fee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOUSER: In line 13, after the word "injury" insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RALPH LAVERN WALKER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2535, for the relief of Ralph LaVern Walker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I will.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would like the gentleman to give me some indication of what his objection is. The War Department admits liability in this case.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman read the words on which he relies in making the statement that the War Department admits liability?

Mr. RAMSPECK. In the report there is this language:

It is the opinion of the board that the preponderance of evidence warrants the conclusion that the dangerous matériel which caused the accident was War Department property.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Those are the words on which the gentleman relies?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. My objection to the bill is, in the first place, that there is absolutely no connection between the cause of this injury and the United States Government. It is so stated in the report, over the signature of Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, notwithstanding the fact that there is an opinion to the effect that the particular item—that is, a bomb, or a detonator, it is called

in the report—which caused this explosion belonged at one time to the War Department, but it is stated that the War Department, and no one connected with the War Department, was the owner of this property, this hand grenade or whatever it was, at the time it was brought into the yard of this boy who picked it up. This is a very distressing case, but there is nothing that ties it up with any liability, even any sympathetic liability, on the part of the United States.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman misunderstands the location. The boy's yard was a part of what was Camp Gordon during the war. The Government dismantled that camp; they advertised for bids and sold this property to the public. This family moved there. I do not know whether they owned the property or whether they were tenants, but the place where the boy found this bomb, or whatever you call it, was on the old camp site. Of course, it was left there by the Army. It failed to explode in their maneuvers there. This is a great big area of hundreds and hundreds of acres, about 13 miles from Atlanta, where they trained hundreds of thousands of men during the war. At all times they had there about 40,000 or 50,000 men. They had all sorts of matériel of that kind, and for several years after the war they had this camp there and had a lot of matériel there, a lot of ammunition. I do not know just exactly when the property was sold, but it was not so very long before this thing happened.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Surely.

Mr. SCHAFER. In view of the fact that the board of officers which conducted this investigation held that—

It is the opinion of the board that the preponderance of evidence warrants the conclusion that the dangerous matériel which caused the accident was War Department property—

I can not see how the gentleman can object to this bill. The words they use are "preponderance of evidence." In view of the fact that it is unreasonable to expect that any private individual or corporation would have had these hand grenades, with detonators on them, on the property, I think the Government is properly charged with the ownership of the property and is responsible for the injury to this child. I certainly hope the gentleman is not going to take it upon himself to indicate that the entire Claims Committee, which spent about 30 minutes in considering this bill, erred in unanimously recommending it.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I think the Claims Committee erred in not carefully reading the report, for if you read the language of the report, you will see that those making the report very carefully refrained from placing any responsibility on the Government. If you were to allow such a claim as this, you might as well say that when a soldier takes his issued revolver or rifle and commits suicide the Government should pay some indemnity, because the property which caused the death or caused the accident belonged to the United States Government.

Mr. SCHAFER. But the board of officers held hearings and carefully investigated all the facts, and that board holds that the preponderance of evidence indicates that the accident was caused by the War Department's matériel. Certainly, the gentleman is not going to take one line of a report from a man here in Washington in opposition to this meritorious claim and deny justice to this injured person.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Let me also call the gentleman's attention to one other statement in the report:

The accident was investigated by a board of officers, the findings of which are in part as follows: That the object which caused the injury was left as a menace to life through the carelessness of party or parties unknown.

Certainly, it must have been left there by the officers or by the enlisted men of the Army, because the only way it ever got on Camp Gordon property was because it was brought there by the Army when it occupied the property.

The report also states that in the activities of the War Department they did have dangerous material of the exact kind here in evidence on the site of Camp Gordon, Ga., where the accident occurred. If this is not an admission that the War Department brought the material there and

that they left it there on the very site where the accident occurred, according to the findings of this board convened by the War Department, I do not know what an admission is.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. No one knows better than the gentleman who is speaking that that is no admission. It is simply a reference to a conclusion by some one who did not personally know anything more about the case than the gentleman from Georgia or myself. The thing that is proven there is that nobody knows how this boy happened to get in touch with the grenade that caused his injury or who is responsible therefor, and they are trying to charge the United States Government with such responsibility without having any proof.

Mr. SCHAFER. If the gentleman will permit, it must be assumed that the War Department issued these grenades because the War Department is the only agency that would have them, and they are issued just the same as rifles are issued for the enlisted men. We also have the report of this board of officers indicating that the preponderance of evidence shows that the injury was suffered by reason of War Department ammunition.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the War Department recommend the payment of this money?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They do not recommend against it.

Mr. SCHAFER. We can not follow the recommendation of some one like Mr. Hurley, who came into the War Department two or three years ago, and use simply one line of his report to overturn the actual weight of the evidence in the case as reviewed in the report.

Mr. BLANTON. I will agree with the gentleman that you can not follow Mr. Hurley at all. His radio speech the other night was ridiculous. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not want to become involved in that matter.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

D. F. PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3621, for the relief of D. F. Phillips.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the author of this bill is our good friend and our good neighbor, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and he is a good neighbor and a good friend, and a most valuable legislator here, and I hate to object to the bill on his account personally, but this would establish a very bad precedent. Here is a rural carrier who served the Government 14 months and quit in 1920. Not a word was heard about any injury, and now after all these years, he comes in and claims an injury of hernia caused, he alleges, by his service in driving over a mountainous road.

This would set a very bad precedent and would culminate in thousands of similar claims being made against the Government. We are better to the rural carriers than to any other class of employees in the United States. They are getting good salaries and lots of them only work three or four hours a day. I am for them and I am their friend, but we ought not to let claims like this pass, and although the gentleman is one of my good friends and is a good neighbor and I like him, I object to his bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker, so that the gentleman may have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. TARVER. Permit me to say to the gentleman that while I thank him for his expressions of friendship, no issue of that character is involved in the consideration of any of these bills. It is a question of justice.

In this case the facts are not distinctly different from those of many cases in which the gentleman has sat silent and permitted the passage of similar legislation upon the floor of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. No one has ever accused me of that before—sitting silent. [Laughter.]

Mr. TARVER. Let me finish my statement, please.

The employees' compensation act, passed in 1916, makes no distinction between employees who sustain injury in service after having been employed 14 months and those who sus-

tain such injury after having been employed during a term of years.

The only other distinction from other bills of like character to which he has not objected which the gentleman seeks to make is that this man is a rural carrier and that rural carriers, for some reason in his opinion, which is not clearly disclosed by his statement, ought to be treated differently and entitled to fewer rights than those which are provided by law for other employees of the United States.

I confess my inability to understand the gentleman's position. The evidence in this case clearly discloses that this man sustained a severe injury in the course of his duty, as a result of which he was compelled to resign as a rural carrier in 1920; and the fact that there are no records showing any complaint by him is accounted for by the report of the Postmaster General, who says that the records of this office were destroyed by fire on a date which he gives in his report, and thereby accounts for the failure of those records to disclose the injury of the man in service and his retirement on account of it.

This bill merely permits this man to have his claim considered under the terms of the law. He did not know, as he says, at the time he resigned anything about the employees' compensation law. It was a new thing.

The question is whether, because this man was a rural carrier, my colleague will object to his being accorded the same consideration which the gentleman has sat here and permitted to be accorded other Federal employees in like cases.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me say that the report shows that Postmaster General Brown says:

While the card records of the department show that Mr. Phillips served as temporary rural carrier at Resaca from December 2, 1918, to January 31, 1919, was appointed regular rural carrier February 1, 1919, and resigned February 29, 1920, we have no record of an injury sustained by him during his term of employment, the correspondence files of the Resaca office prior to January 1, 1921, having been destroyed.

Then the correspondence shows that the files of the office prior to January 1, 1921, have been destroyed. When were they destroyed? It does not show when; they might have been destroyed last year or the year before that. The fact remains that this claim, if it accrued at all, accrued before the date in 1920 when he resigned. Why has not the claim been here in 1921, 1922, and 1923?

Mr. TARVER. Why has not my colleague objected to the hundreds of other bills for employees who were not rural carriers which provided for the consideration of claims just like this since the passage of the act of September 7, 1916?

Mr. BLANTON. I have objected to all bills I deemed unmeritorious. This is the first time I have ever been criticized for not objecting to bills. I have been criticized heretofore for objecting to too many of them. While I regret exceedingly to do so, I object.

PAUL I. MORRIS AND BEULAH FULLER MORRIS

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 3628, for the relief of Paul I. Morris and Beulah Fuller Morris.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill consent to striking out all of lines 3 to 11 on the first page, leaving in the bill only the reimbursement of the father and mother of the child?

Mr. TARVER. Let me say that I see no reason why that action should be taken. If my colleague will examine the report, and I presume he has, he will discover that the proposed legislation, which is somewhat identical in context with legislation which has heretofore been enacted by this House, provides for compensation to the dependent parents for the death of a trainee occurring because of disease contracted while in a citizens' military training camp.

This young man, according to the report of the War Department, contracted spinal meningitis while in attendance on the citizens' military training camp at Fort McClellan, Ala., dying as the result, and leaving dependent parents. Is there any reason why the dependent parents should not

be compensated according to the employees' compensation law? If there is, I would be glad to consider the gentleman's reason.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Having in mind the statute applicable at the time of this deplorable death, unless the gentleman is willing to take what he otherwise would have been entitled to, and which is recognized by the War Department as the proper sum, I will have to object.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will notice from the report that there was a bill enacted in the last Congress in an exactly similar case. Why should the gentleman think that this bill should be distinguished from that?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The bill the gentleman alludes to was for a definite amount, for an injury caused by an accident and was not a matter of sickness. The details of the two bills are as dissimilar as two bills could be.

Mr. TARVER. The compensation law makes no distinction between an injury and physical disease incurred in service, and there is no reason for excluding all cases of death by disease from remedial legislation.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Let me say once more that the bill referred to by the gentleman was for the cost of medical attention and services, and there was a definite amount, about \$150.

Mr. TARVER. No; it was \$100 a month.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I have the bill here. In this bill the amount these people would be entitled to under the statute at the time would be about \$400 or a little less. There has been added onto that, \$379.25. An attempt is made to make a comparison as between death by spinal meningitis and injury to an arm or a leg. They are not comparable. The point is that the War Department says the man is entitled to about \$400. The paragraph in the bill names \$764 as paying in full every detailed item which the War Department finds was asked for in accordance with the statute.

Mr. TARVER. The statute does not cover it at all. The gentleman is absolutely in error. There is no \$400 or any other sum provided for by statute.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Unless the gentleman will permit me to make a full explanation, I shall be forced to make the point of no quorum. I am asking only an opportunity to inform the gentleman of facts that he evidently does not know; and if he refuses me that privilege, I must necessarily interfere with the business of the House by making the point of no quorum.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If the gentleman wishes me to reserve the right to object so that he can make a further speech, I shall be glad to do so, and I shall listen to what he says, but I warn the gentleman not to go outside of the record.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has never been able to show me where I have been outside of the record, but I shall be able to show the gentleman that he has not read the record. The evidence in this case as disclosed by the report shows that the funeral expenses, doctors' bills, nurse hire, and hospital bills of this boy amounted to exactly the amount that is set out in the report, the sum of \$764. I have in the anteroom the receipts and canceled checks showing the exact amount which is claimed in the bill. Nor is there any basis for the gentleman's statement that some \$400 of this amount is recognized by the War Department as properly due. The law of 1928 which provides for the payment in cases not exactly similar but somewhat similar to this of doctors' bills and funeral expenses provides for the payment of such expenses only in cases where the sickness began in camp and the treatment began there and was continued after the trainee left camp. This is not such a case, and therefore the provisions of the law which the gentleman thinks applicable have no reference to it whatever. Further, I call the gentleman's attention to another case, which is only one of many, that of the bill proposed during the last Congress for the relief of Herbert E. Zook, in which, by the recommendation of the Secretary of War, Mr. Hurley,

a young man who was injured in line of duty at Camp Grant, Ill., was to be accorded the benefits of the employees' compensation act—not an adverse recommendation, such as the same Secretary makes in this case, but a favorable recommendation. Permit me to ask the gentleman why a trainee, who happens to be injured at Camp Grant, Ill., should have extended to him the provisions of the employees' compensation act of 1916, while the dependents of a trainee injured at Camp McClellan, Ala., should be denied the benefits of that law? I show the gentleman the report of the Claims Committee in the case to which I have referred, so that he may check up on the facts. If the gentleman simply intends to object irrespective of what the facts are, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is rather unfair to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Eaton]. The gentleman from Colorado was willing to allow the parents the amount for hospitalization and medical services that the statute allows.

Mr. TARVER. But nothing for his life.

Mr. STAFFORD. We do not grant anything for the life of a soldier killed in action. If we did, the Government would be bankrupt.

Mr. TARVER. The Secretary of War recommended it in this case for injuries to a trainee at Camp Grant, Ill.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there is such a case, it was a pure accident and should not be used as a precedent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I have not heard the gentleman say whether he will consent to accepting the \$764.

Mr. TARVER. No; I will not consent.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I object.

T. BROOKS ALFORD

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4227) for the relief of T. Brooks Alford.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced in the last Congress but failed to pass simply because it was not reached on the calendar. This man Alford was in the United States Consular Service for a period of more than two years.

Mr. MOUSER. Permit me to ask the gentleman a few questions, and if he desires to elaborate upon his explanations, perhaps we can reach what I have in mind. As I understand it, this gentleman was assistant consul in Russia during the World War.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. MOUSER. He was then ordered to Copenhagen.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. MOUSER. Prior to the close of the war he left the place where he was located, at Riga, and made no endeavor to take his property with him, or at least left nobody to look after it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I may say in reply that the gentleman was really lucky to get away with his life. That was during the revolution in Russia. In the hearings before the committee, of which committee the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. RAMSPECK, was a member, in many instances it was shown that he was fortunate to get away with his life. Instead of returning home by the European ports, he was compelled to make his way through Asia, and finally was captured and sentenced to be shot, but he finally escaped and landed in Japan and then shipped over the Pacific. It is one of the most unusual cases I have ever encountered as a result of the war.

Mr. MOUSER. A part of his claim was based on the amount spent for medical service as the result of his nervous breakdown while stationed at Riga?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. MOUSER. Notwithstanding that nervous breakdown he did later arrive in Copenhagen and served in the capacity of assistant consul and drew pay from the Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. In a letter in which he requested his resignation, the gentleman will find some evidence on that point.

Mr. MOUSER. If the gentleman will accept an amendment as to the amount of the medical expenses, I will not object.

Mr. McMILLAN. The gentleman will see in the report that he has a number of statements from several physicians who have examined and treated him since his return home.

Mr. MOUSER. I do not think there is any question that he had a nervous breakdown because of the pressure he was under in Russia, serving his country.

Mr. McMILLAN. Exactly.

Mr. MOUSER. Therefore, I think he should be compensated for his medical expenses, but I can not see where the Government owes him any obligation to pay for his property.

Mr. McMILLAN. May I say in explanation this gentleman offered his service under the draft act, and at the request of the State Department he was requested to continue his service in the consular service.

Mr. MOUSER. He was cited for meritorious service.

Mr. McMILLAN. He was cited for meritorious service.

Mr. MOUSER. There is no question about his service.

Mr. McMILLAN. In the Seventy-first Congress H. R. 10919, an omnibus bill, was passed, including some 30 or 40 men in the Consular Service, covering just such cases as this.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman accept the amendment which I suggested?

Mr. McMILLAN. What is the amount?

Mr. MOUSER. The gentleman claims he spent \$5,000. Of course, the bill is only for \$4,000. There is no property listed here. We do not know what that was. Therefore it should be confined to the medical expenses.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am frank to say I could not accept that amendment, because here is a man whose health is ruined and he is to-day suffering as a result of that experience.

Mr. MOUSER. There is no itemized statement as to his property.

Mr. McMILLAN. And under other existing provisions of law the men who served in the military service have been protected. The men mentioned in this bill to which I have just referred have been compensated for their loss.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman accept an amendment reducing the amount to \$3,000?

Mr. McMILLAN. It shows there was \$7,500 involved.

Mr. MOUSER. We have to go by what the bill says. The bill says \$4,000.

Mr. McMILLAN. Of course, if the gentleman is going to restrict me to a reduction of that character, naturally I will have to accept.

Mr. MOUSER. In view of the fact that there is no statement of the property, we can not consider that.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think it is a very reasonable amount.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to this bill. The State Department says:

The records of the department do not reveal any circumstances which would bring Mr. Alford within the scope of any existing law under which a recommendation for his relief could properly be made.

If this bill is passed, it means that thousands of claims that have been filed against the Government of Russia would be propounded against our Government, and we would have just the same obligation to pay one as the other. That is the first reason for objection.

The second is that our Government is not an insurer of the property of its officers, and we do not want to go into that field. If my house should be destroyed by fire, I would not expect the Government of the United States to reimburse me.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield, but shall object to the bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say in explanation of the gentleman's inquiry that the State Department further said that under the facts surrounding this case it is one in which Congress alone can decide whether or not he is entitled to any compensation as a result of this experience, and, furthermore, if we had, under existing law, a provision to take care of a case such as this, then there would be no necessity of a private bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 4421, for the relief of the Southern Railway Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill would take \$29,000 out of the Treasury, and I must object. While \$29,000 is not such a tremendous sum of money, still it is more than the great majority of the people ever have had, have now, or ever will have in cash. Taken with other sums that are continually appropriated out of the Treasury aggregate the huge sum that causes deficits at the end of the year. While I regret to have to do it, I object to the bill.

LEBANON EQUITY EXCHANGE, LEBANON, NEBR.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Private Calendar, S. 944, for the relief of the Lebanon Equity Exchange, of Lebanon, Nebr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOUSER. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, at the opening of the consideration of private claim bills the Speaker of the House of Representatives called attention to the fact that it would involve the expenditure on the part of the Government of hundreds of millions of dollars if these refund claims were allowed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman requested—

Mr. NORTON. The Lebanon Equity Exchange is a farmers' cooperative association at Lebanon, Nebr. For the year 1920 it paid Federal income taxes in excess of \$2,500. The Treasury Department decided in 1929 that said exchange was exempt from the payment of such taxes and was, therefore, not required to file returns for 1927 and prior years. Whereupon the exchange filed claim for refund of income taxes, which had been paid in error. The Government pleaded the statute of limitations. The Treasury Department states that the last payment of taxes was made February 24, 1925, and that the claim for refund was not filed until August 9, 1929, or a little more than five months over the four years provided by law.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to receive, consider, and determine in accordance with law, but without regard to any statute of limitations, the claim to be filed by the exchange within the time specified in this bill.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. MOUSER. There is no question but what this amount has been paid to the Government and the Government has the money.

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MOUSER. The sole question is that the claim was not filed within nearly six months of when it should have been.

Mr. NORTON. That is correct.

Mr. MOUSER. There is no interest included in this amount is there?

Mr. NORTON. None is asked.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NANCY H. ROUSE AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1357, for the relief of Nancy H. Rouse, Clara H. Simmons, W. H. Hays, Hallie H. Hamilton, and Bradford P. Hays.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Kentucky has just furnished me a supplemental report, or, rather, part 2 of the report, which was filed on April 18.

The original report, which the supplemental report does not dispute, shows that no one suffered any injury in this case except Mr. Carr. There was no real damage done these persons. They were deprived of the use of the road a part of the day.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. No injury was suffered except the deprivation of the use of the road while the soldiers were engaged in artillery fire.

Mr. SWICK. The situation continues to-day just as it was then. They are deprived of the use of that road.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. In the supplemental report, on page 4, is a letter from the Secretary of War, dated March 18, 1932, which deals with the particular bill under discussion, whereas the original report from the War Department that the gentleman from Wisconsin now has deals with a bill of a different nature.

The present bill simply authorizes the parties to institute suit in the Court of Claims or in the district court of the United States to ascertain and recover such damages, if any, as they may be able to show under the law.

There is more to the claim than a loss of the use of the road. The proof shows they are unable to get tenants to farm this tract of land because of artillery fire and rifle-range practice.

Mr. STAFFORD. The owners of the land had the right to go to the Court of Claims to present their claims. There was an agency of the Government provided for that purpose. Now, long years afterwards they ask to be granted this right, probably because some claim agent in Washington suggested to them that perhaps they can get something out of the Government.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. May I say to the gentleman they have been endeavoring through the years to effect an adjustment with the War Department?

Mr. SWICK. What are they asking for?

Mr. CARDEN. They are just asking the right to institute suit.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Just the right to go into court.

Mr. SWICK. They are not asking for any specific sum of money?

Mr. CARDEN. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Their original claim was for \$35,000.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. They are just asking the right to take the matter into court.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on the ground that the original report which is applicable to the same state of facts—

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The original report deals with a different bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. In which the department found that there was only one person who had any real claim, I shall not interpose an objection. I do not wish in the consideration of these cases to be obdurate and assert an objection where there is a possibility of a righteous claim. Therefore, I withdraw the objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Nancy H. Rouse, Clara H. Simmons, W. H. Hays, Hallie H. Hamilton, and Bradford P. Hays, owners of a certain farm consisting of 332 acres, more or less, near Camp Knox in Hardin County, Ky., are hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States or the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the above owners of said property, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and not withstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations: *Provided,* That such action will be brought within one year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN CLAIMANTS WHO SUFFERED LOSS BY FIRE IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 491, for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by fire in the State of Minnesota during October, 1918.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota explain the necessity of passing this bill.

Mr. PITTINGER. Has the gentleman had an opportunity to read the hearings on the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I have carefully considered the 23-page report made by the committee. It is a fact, is it not, that 10 per cent more than \$13,000,000 has already been paid?

Mr. PITTINGER. Those figures are probably approximately correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill, if passed, will take the huge sum of \$10,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury and pay to claimants, and I shall object.

Mr. PITTINGER. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. It would be a waste of time, for I could not let this \$10,000,000 be taken out of the Treasury in its present depleted condition. Ten million dollars is a large sum of money. It is hard to raise in taxes. If we allow this bill to pass this afternoon, we will have to levy further taxes upon the people to raise this \$10,000,000. Just how will we tax the people to raise it? The Senate has taxed picture shows and talking movies until the Publix and many other leading show houses have already closed down, and every American child who wants to see a 15-cent picture show will have to pay a tax. I am in favor of defeating this proposed tax on movies. It ought to come off. Attending a movie once in a while is about all the pleasure and recreation that many families who work hard all day have, and we want to make the admission as cheap as possible.

The first-class postage has been raised from 2 to 3 cents. That is outrageous. We ought to kill that provision. This House placed a tax on stock transfers on the gambling exchanges of New York and other large cities, and the Senate has stricken that provision out. If we will properly tax stock transfer in gambling transactions, we will not have to raise the postage from 2 to 3 cents and we will not have to tax the children's picture shows.

We have taxed the people just about all they are able to pay, and that is why I am not in favor of taxing them more to raise this \$10,000,000 that this bill would take out of the Treasury. I therefore object to the bill.

AMY HARDING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 550, for the relief of Amy Harding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 154 will be substituted for the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of Amy Harding on account of her personal-injury damages resulting from the Army airplane accident at Langin Field, Moundsville, W. Va., July 10, 1921, and to allow said claim in an amount not exceeding \$43.33, as recommended by the Comptroller General of the United States in his report to the Congress dated June 18, 1930, Seventy-first Congress, second session, pursuant to the act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 1707). The sum of \$43.33, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of said claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

LUCY MURPHY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 632, for the relief of Lucy Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucy Murphy the sum of \$5,000 as reimbursement to her for the loss suffered by her in the death of her husband, Maurice Murphy, now deceased, whose death occurred on April 21, 1929, without fault on his part or on her part, through the collision of a trimotored Ford airplane belonging to the Maddux Air Lines (Inc.), of Los Angeles, Calif., bearing factory number 5-AT-10, license numbered NC 9638, near San Diego, Calif., with an airplane belonging to the War Department of the United States, which was then and there operated in a wrongful and negligent manner by Lieut. Howard Keefer, a United States pilot, then and there flying under orders and in line of duty.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. On page 1, line 6, after the figures "\$5,000," insert the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 6, after the figures "\$5,000," insert the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the bill I offer the usual attorneys' fee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 2, line 6, after the word "duty," insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WESTERN ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 692, for the relief of Western Electric Co. (Inc.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear from the author of the bill as to its merits, and a good reason for now passing it. Without such explanation, I shall be forced to object.

There are 809 bills on this Private Calendar, all seeking to take money out of the Federal Treasury. Some involve very large sums of money. Here and there you will find a bill on this calendar that seeks to appropriate several millions of dollars out of the Treasury. Some of these 809 bills are good and meritorious and ought to be passed, but some are wholly without merit, and to pass them would be almost a crime against the trusting taxpayers of this country.

Under the rules to-day, when each bill is called by the Clerk, unless some Member is upon his feet and promptly objects to its passage, it is passed in the twinkling of an eye, merely by the Speaker stating, "Without objection, this bill is considered, read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid upon the table," and that short but decisive action passes the bill.

To stop these bad bills from passing, it is necessary for some of us to carefully investigate each and every one of these 809 bills as soon as they are favorably reported and placed on the calendar, and to be prepared to be able to make timely objections, and to be here and promptly make the objection when the bill is called up. Otherwise you could not tax the people enough to keep any money in the public Treasury, for every dollar that goes in the Treasury comes out of the pockets of the people in burdensome taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

CARL F. CASTLEBERRY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 873, for the relief of Carl F. Castleberry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman kindly indicate the ground of his objection to this bill?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say in favor of this bill. Apparently you are trying to collect damages. Here is a case where a man elected in 1922 to collect damages for an injury which he received as a railway mail clerk. He had his opportunity to make an application for compensation under the compensation law. He elected to take damages instead of the \$66.66 a month, and 10 years afterwards he wants to have everything in the past set aside and to collect compensation from that time until now. I was very much interested in noting that there is not a single offer by him or on his behalf to reimburse the United States for any amount he collected as damages. It looks like an unfair claim.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. The point involved is simply this: This man was in the Railway Mail Service and was injured by a wreck on the train while on active duty, and sustained an injury. He thought, and was so advised by the attending physician, that it would not be a matter of serious consequence, and he made a settlement with the railroad company for the injury sustained.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. One thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. He did not file any claim with the Compensation Commission.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. But, on the contrary, he was advised of his rights time after time by the Compensation Commission, and at the end of a year he advised the Compensation Commission that he did not want to make a claim and instead he made a settlement with the railroad company.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. If the gentleman will kindly refer to the report, I think he will be impressed with the language used, as I have been, by the chairman of the Compensation Commission:

Should the proposed measure be enacted into law the limitations hereinbefore referred to would be removed and the commission would be able to receive and consider Mr. Castleberry's claim, which appears to have strong equities.

The only purpose of this measure is to allow this man an opportunity to file his claim with the agency of the Government constituted for that purpose, to consider his claim the same as it considers all other claims; in other words, to allow him the opportunity of having his day in court and an opportunity of receiving consideration by the Employees' Compensation Commission. This is all that is provided for in the bill, and this is all that is sought.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have a case where a railway mail clerk immediately after the accident availed himself of the damages that he might recover from the railroad company and, also, perhaps received the benefits of insurance in the railway mail clerks' organization. If he had filed his claim then, he would have been entitled to monthly compensation dating from the time of the injury back in 1921. I know my friend from Tennessee will have no objection to providing that the measure shall not be retroactive, as we do in all such cases.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman, very frankly, this is a bill of my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], who is unavoidably absent to-day, and I am simply undertaking to look after the matter in the gentleman's absence.

LXXV—742

Mr. STAFFORD. There have been some instances where we have reinstated claims of this character, some of them where the claimant did not know of the law and others where, for some reason, they did not file the claim. In this case the Government has not been out any money by virtue of this man not having filed his claim originally. The claimant has not received any money from the Government, although he has received money from the railroad company, but the money he received from the railroad company would not have barred him from relief under the employees' compensation act.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Only to the extent of repaying the Government and having deducted from the amount of money he got from the Government all money he received as damages.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this injury having occurred in 1921, under the law, the man would be entitled to the sum of \$66 a month, and the gentleman will readily see that in two years that amount would have entirely offset the amount received as damages. The Government has been the gainer. If this claimant, a former railway mail clerk, for some reason did not then wish to present a claim, or if, perhaps, he felt he could get along without making such claim, but is now in straitened circumstances, I think we should grant him the privilege of being accorded such rights under the customary stipulations which we generally follow.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, may I supplement the splendid statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin to this extent? All the records presented in the report very clearly indicate that this man has suffered a permanent injury. He did not know, and his physician did not know, at the time of the injury, that it would be a matter of such serious consequences.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Carl F. Castleberry, who was injured while in the employ of the Railway Mail Service in a railroad accident on December 2, 1921, resulting in permanent physical and mental disability. The United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to consider and act upon his claim, No. 104497, under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, as if his claim and notice had been filed within 60 days after said accident: *Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue hereunder until after the enactment of this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to consider and determine the claim of Carl F. Castleberry for an injury purporting to have occurred while employed in the Railway Mail Service on or about December 2, 1921, in the same manner and to the same extent as if Carl F. Castleberry had made application for the benefits of said act within the 1-year period required by sections 17 and 20 thereof: *Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RAYMOND NELSON HICKMAN

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 5999, for the relief of Raymond Nelson Hickman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I object.

ASA G. AYER

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1843, for the relief of Capt. Asa G. Ayer. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I would like an explanation of the bill from the author, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to act as proxy for the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has been called out of the Chamber.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to know if the bill embraces any of the rigid provisions he had in his bill against birth control, which he said his secretary introduced for him by mistake?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; this is for the remission of a bond given by Captain Ayer for failure to appear as a material witness in a case in a district court and does not involve any midwife or maternity restrictions. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. The bill that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] introduced, and which he sought to withdraw, was full of rigid restrictions against birth control, and I wanted to be sure that none of them had gotten into this bill.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. MOUSER. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have the peculiar condition in this report, that a former attorney general, John S. Sargent, from the Granite State, very obdurate in his opinions, recommended favorable action on this bill. But the present Attorney General takes a counter position.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is always here on the occasions when we have a beer bill up, and he is always here on the occasions when we have a bill for repealing the eighteenth amendment. He comes in also and makes periodical speeches against Methodist Bishops and the representation of the South in Congress. Why is he not here when his bill comes up?

Mr. STAFFORD. As I stated to the gentleman, I was under the impression the gentleman from Massachusetts was called out of the Chamber.

Mr. BLANTON. Has he gone off on an elephant hunt? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOUSER. I object.

CAPT. CHESTER J. DICK

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 2063, for the relief of Capt. Chester J. Dick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate bill, S. 669, an identical bill, will be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 669

An act for the relief of Chester J. Dick

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Chester J. Dick, captain, Finance Department, United States Army, in an amount not to exceed \$662.77, representing the amount of stoppage against the pay of the said Chester J. Dick ordered by The Adjutant General because of the embezzlement by Otto Melton, former civilian cashier, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., of funds for which the said Chester J. Dick was accountable.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Chester J. Dick an amount equal to the amounts paid by him to the United States in partial settlement of the said obligation of \$662.77.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The House bill was laid on the table.

BROOKHILL CORPORATION

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 212, for the relief of the Brookhill Corporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

CHICO-WESTWOOD-SUSANVILLE AUTO STAGE CO., CHICO, CALIF.

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 3526, for the relief of the Chico-Westwood-Susanville Auto Stage Co., Chico, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

HOMER J. WILLIAMSON

The Clerk read the title of the next bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 4162, for the relief of Homer J. Williamson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will if the gentleman will not indulge in a tirade about making socialists, as he did before.

Mr. LUDLOW. There will be no dissertation on socialism, but I would like to present the facts in this case. This is a righteous claim, if there ever was one before Congress. This young manufacturer of candy in the city of Indianapolis wanted to do the right thing in filing his income-tax returns. It occurred to him that the best way to make an honest, fair, and legal return would be to take the advice of the local officials of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Then he did the very proper thing. He went to the Indianapolis Internal Revenue Office with his figures and laid all of his facts about his income before the officials there. They made out his return and not until five years later, after the statute of limitations had run, was he notified by an official of the Government that the return had been made out improperly and that he had been overcharged in the sum of \$1,045.81. There was no way in the world for him to know that this mistake had been made. His intent was perfectly good. The error was committed by an agent of the Government, and this bill is to refund to this business man in Indianapolis the amount which was erroneously overpaid in income taxes through no fault of his own and on a return that was made out for him by an agent of the Government. I do not believe there could be a more just claim against the Government than this one.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are many instances where the taxpayers called on representatives of the Government for aid and where mistakes were made. The Speaker of the House early in the session called attention to the fact that if we reopen these tax refund cases from his experience on the Ways and Means Committee it would involve an expenditure running into hundreds of millions of dollars. There may be merit in this case, but we should not adopt the policy of opening the door in such a case as this; otherwise we would have to open it to many others. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RALPH E. WILLIAMSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4911) for the relief of Ralph E. Williamson for loss suffered on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I had this bill marked down for objection myself, but I find that all of the others have been paid, and it seems to me in common justice that this one ought to be paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] for withholding his objection. Permit me to say that the amount involved in this bill is only \$525. A bill passed the Seventieth Congress for about \$70,000 involving the same circumstances. The name of Ralph Williamson was merely left out of the original bill inadvertently, through no fault of mine and through no fault of this claimant. Inasmuch as all the other claimants have been paid by this Government, and a thorough investigation was made by a former Congress, it seems that the gentleman from Wisconsin might withdraw his objection and permit this claim to go through.

If time permitted me to go into the history of the case, I am sure I could explain to the entire satisfaction of the

gentleman that this is a just claim. If he will read the report of a previous Congress, as well as the report of the present Claims Committee, he will find that the Government was entirely at fault; and if the gentleman so desires, I shall be glad to give him all the information he wishes on this claim.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am more concerned with the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] that prior Congresses have enacted bills for the reimbursement of claims arising out of this situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. And they have been enacted into law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$565 to Ralph E. Williamson, as compensation in full for loss of property destroyed by the fire on September 24, 1917, in the city of Lawton, Okla., such loss having been the result of the inability of the fire department of the city of Lawton to control said fire because of lack of water, all available water for fire-fighting purposes having been appropriated and being used by the War Department in connection with the training of soldiers at Fort Sill and Camp Doniphan: *Provided*, That before said claim is allowed and paid the Comptroller General of the United States shall make an investigation of said claim to determine the extent and amount of such loss and damage, and such claim shall be adjusted in amount not in excess of the amount set out herein and upon certificates issued to said claimant by the said Comptroller General of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE BOIES

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the membership of this House to the death yesterday of the Hon. William Dayton Boies, my immediate predecessor.

Judge Boies, as he was familiarly known, was a resident of Sheldon, Iowa. He served as judge of the fourth judicial district of Iowa for several terms, and in 1918 was elected a Representative in Congress from my district.

In his service as a public official he had a record as one who fulfilled that public trust honestly, fearlessly, and faithfully. He was a member of the Judiciary Committee, a position which, owing to his legal ability, he was well able to fill. For 10 years he served in Congress and voluntarily resigned by reason of ill health. Many Members of this Congress knew him well and appreciate the associations they had with him.

I shall never forget the helpful advice that he gave me as his successor, and the news of his death will bring sadness to those of us who have had the pleasure of his personal association.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 2, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, June 2, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

Hearings—Garner relief bill—Government officials.

PUBLIC LANDS

(10.30 a. m.)

Hearings—Grazing bill.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10 a. m.)

Hearings—Columbia River Basin project.

NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Hearings—Private bills.

LIBRARY

General hearing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

596. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated May 28, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Newagen Harbor, Southport, Me.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

597. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, in response to House Resolution 213, dated May 14, 1932, requesting information concerning the investigation conducted under the authority of the antidumping act in respect to the importation of ammonium sulphate and reporting that in his opinion the transmission of such information is not compatible with the public interest (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BANKHEAD: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 238. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10048, a bill granting to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California certain public and reserved lands of the United States in the counties of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino, in the State of California, for an aqueduct, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1462). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BANKHEAD: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 241. A resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission and specifying the powers and duties thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 12202. A bill to extend certain provisions of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, to the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 352. A joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to request allocation of funds; also to establish a research laboratory for utilizing cotton, cotton hulls, seed, lint, and waste farm products; with amendment (Rept. No. 1465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9265. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER of New York: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12077. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission,

its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the east branch of the Niagara River at or near the city of Tonawanda, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER of New York: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12078. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the east branch of the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12243. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12316. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Helena, Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LOZIER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2609. A bill for the relief of Anna Volker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6150. A bill for the relief of William Wichmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6235. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samuel A. Riddick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LOZIER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6890. A bill for the relief of the Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8710. A bill for the relief of Emerson C. Salisbury; with amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9215. A bill for the relief of E. C. West; without amendment (Rept. No. 1471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9284. A bill for the relief of Capt. J. O. Faria; with amendment (Rept. No. 1472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9964. A bill for the relief of Bonnie S. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11525. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Johnson, State treasurer of the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12188. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George B. Gates; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. S. 660. An act for the relief of Hamilton Grounds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. S. 3344. An act for the relief of Maggie Kirkland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11102. A bill for the relief of Mary One Goose; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LOOFBOUROW: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11191. A bill for the relief of P. H. Palmer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11259. A bill for the relief of John E. Click; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11659. A bill authorizing the exchange of certain patented lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11798. A bill to authorize the addition of certain names to the final roll of the Sac and Fox Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LA GUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 12406) to amend section 156 of title 8 of the United States Code, originally enacted as section 20 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12407) to prohibit discrimination against graduates of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy by reason of marriage after graduation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 12408) to reduce the rate of interest on loans upon adjusted-service certificates and to give such certificates a loan value immediately upon the issuance thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12409) to provide for advances to States for the relief of distress arising from unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12410) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act to authorize loans for the purpose of providing additional employment through the construction of economically sound projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 243) to provide for an investigation of the monetary, banking, currency, and financial systems of the United States, the fiscal affairs of the United States Government, and the laws relating thereto, and for a comprehensive report concerning these matters to aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation, and to assist in the recovery of moneys not properly accounted for which may be due to the Government and the people of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 244) for the consideration of H. R. 10236, an act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LA GUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) amending Public Resolution No. 12, authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLCOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) to amend the tariff act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) creating a joint committee to investigate and report upon matters respecting private claims; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12411) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 12412) granting a pension to Ellen McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 12413) for the relief of Charles C. Schilling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12414) for the relief of Benjamin F. Gates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 12415) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12416) granting an increase of pension to Mary Buhrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12417) to correct the naval record of James William Boyd; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12418) for the relief of Harry Norfleet Legg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 12419) granting a pension to Lucy McManning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12420) granting a pension to Martha Katherine Hazelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8073. By Mr. ALMON: Petition of Nettie H. Walters, president, and Jessie Hill, secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Florence, Ala., together with 171 other citizens, supporting the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8074. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of John Howard Strain Post, No. 139, American Legion, Department of California, memorializing Congress to enact such legislation as may provide for the \$5,000,000,000 bond issue at once; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8075. Also, petition of San Luis Obispo Post, No. 66, American Legion, San Luis Obispo, Calif., approving the passage of House bill 11550 for the best interests of veterans of all wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

8076. Also, petition of Templeton Post, No. 220, American Legion, Department of California, favoring the passage of House bill 11550 as the best pension bill as yet offered in justice to the ex-service men who paid so dearly for their service to their country in the late war; to the Committee on Pensions.

8077. Also, petition of Echo Park Post, American Legion of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning Congress to enact and adopt at the earliest possible opportunity House bill 11550, also known as the uniform pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

8078. Also, petition of David T. Nichols and several other citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 9891, the railway employees' bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

8079. Also, petition of Los Angeles Chapter, California State Master Chirotonors Association, favoring the bill now pending in Congress providing for a \$5,000,000,000 public-improvement loan and expenditure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8080. Also, petition of L. A. Srygley and other citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning that the 12-hour day for radio operators be abolished; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

8081. Also, petition of Walter N. Thompson, of Huntington Beach, Calif., presenting his plan for terminating the

depression and restoring good times; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8082. Also, petition of board of directors, Kiwanis Club of Los Angeles, Calif., urging Congress to refrain from individual party politics and pass a tax bill which will balance the Budget at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8083. Also, petition of Keith Powell Post, No. 78, American Legion, Department of California, opposing all efforts on the part of debtor nations to promote any further moratorium or reduction of war debts to this Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8084. Also, petition of Matthias Gibson and many other citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., urging opposition to House bill 6385, which would permit the substitution of a member of the crew for a licensed radio operator on any coastwise vessel of the United States not now required by law to be equipped with radio-telegraph apparatus; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

8085. Also, petition of David A. Nelson, of Los Angeles, Calif., presenting his plan for terminating the depression and restoring good times; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8086. By Mr. HERR: Petition by telegraph of several hundred registered voters and business men of Tacoma, Wash., urging passage of the soldiers' bonus before Congress adjourns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8087. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Thirty-fourth Street-Midtown Association (Inc.), New York City, and other business organizations, urging the reduction of Federal expenditures, passage of a reasonable tax measure, balancing the Budget, and modifying the Volstead Act to provide an additional source of revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8088. Also, petition of the North American Coal Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the reduction of Federal expenditures, a modified sales tax, and repeal of the prohibition act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8089. Also, petition of J. H. Shinn, 367 Lincoln Place, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the appropriation of \$300,000 for the Federal Trade Commission in the independent office bill for continuing the examination of public-utility companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8090. Also, petition of Roger W. Allen, publisher, New York City, opposing the passage of House Joint Resolution 404, permitting advertisements to be placed on United States mail trucks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8091. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of board of directors of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, favoring a proposed expenditure of \$500,000,000 for the development of localized projects for the benefit of certain portions of the country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8092. Also, petition of Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, asking for the drafting of a bill to restore work opportunities for the millions of wage earners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8093. Also, petition of Kiwanis Club of East Aurora, urging retrenchment of expenses and appropriations and to provide necessary means to balance the Nation's Budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8094. Also, petition of American Cotton Manufacturers Association, urging the balancing of the Budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8095. Also, petition of Federation of Jewish Women's Organization (Inc.), regarding matters of legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8096. Also, petition of citizens of Buffalo, favoring House bill 10023; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8097. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Workers Ex-Service Men's League, New York City, favoring the passage of the Patman bill, H. R. 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8098. Also, petition of Roger W. Allen, publisher, New York City, opposing the passage of House Joint Resolution 404; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8099. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Lillian R. Ames and 23 other citizens of Exeter, Me., urging reduced Government expenditures, particularly in payments and pensions to veterans not disabled in time of war, and prompt action to balance the Budget; to the Committee on Economy.

8100. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition signed by W. H. Bobenhouse, of Rydal; Joseph Johnson, of Scandia; K. R. Higbee, of Formoso; A. R. Jacobson, of Montrose; and 52 others of Republic and Jewell Counties, all of the State of Kansas, favoring the repeal of the agricultural marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of citizens of the State of New Jersey, supporting the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8102. Also, petition of Municipal Council of Arroyo, Province of Masbate, P. I., expressing congratulations to Representative HARE and the Members of the United States Congress for the passage of the Hare independence bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

8103. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging Congress to enact a statute imposing a severe penalty for the crime of kidnaping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1932

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 1, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 154. An act for the relief of Amy Harding;

S. 669. An act for the relief of Chester J. Dick; and

S. 1357. An act for the relief of Nancy H. Rouse, Clara H. Simmons, W. H. Hays, Hallie H. Hamilton, and Bradford P. Hays.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 811) for the relief of Sophia A. Beers, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Lucy Murphy;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Carl F. Castleberry;

H. R. 964. An act for the relief of Howard Emmett Tallmadge;

H. R. 1174. An act for the relief of Mary A. Cox;

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Charles W. Dworack;

H. R. 2478. An act for the relief of Silas B. Lawrence;

H. R. 2599. An act for the relief of Henry Dixon Linebarger;

H. R. 3029. An act for the relief of William K. Lovett;

H. R. 3460. An act for the relief of Caughman-Kaminer Co.;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Rosamond B. McManus;

H. R. 4911. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Williamson for loss suffered on account of the Lawton (Okla.) fire, 1917;

H. R. 5595. An act for the relief of Harry Manning Lee;

H. R. 5682. An act for the relief of Miles Thomas Barrett;

H. R. 6003. An act for the relief of A. L. Marshall;

H. R. 6855. An act for the relief of Sam Echols;

H. R. 7656. An act for the relief of William R. Nolan; and

H. R. 8174. An act to exempt from the quota fathers and mothers over 60 years of age of United States citizens.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Davis	Kean	Schall
Bankhead	Dickinson	Kendrick	Sheppard
Barkley	Dill	Keyes	Shipstead
Bingham	Fess	King	Shortridge
Black	Fletcher	La Follette	Smith
Blaine	Frazier	Logan	Smoot
Borah	George	McGill	Stephens
Bratton	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Glenn	McNary	Trammell
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulow	Gore	Moses	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Cohen	Hastings	Nye	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hatfield	Oddie	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Patterson	Wheeler
Copeland	Hebert	Pittman	White
Costigan	Hull	Reed	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent as a member of the Geneva conference and that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that the following-named Senators are detained in a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency: Mr. NORBECK, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. COUZENS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, praying for the adoption of House Resolution No. 214, submitted by Mr. SHANNON, authorizing an investigation into the activities of the Government in competition with private enterprise, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECTS THROUGH THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BARBOUR presented a letter from D. J. O'Connor, manager of the Jackson (Mich.) Chamber of Commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON, MICH., May 31, 1932.

Senator W. WARREN BARBOUR,

United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARBOUR: I have very carefully gone over your bill which was introduced to expand the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and I believe that it is one of the most constructive pieces of legislation with regard to the relief of the unemployed that has been devised to date.

I have had a great deal of experience in organizing of late, building and modernizing projects for the relief of the unemployed as well as stimulating the general business through the sale of building supplies and material.

Your bill should initiate such a movement nationally and should be of great assistance for the relief of the unemployed, especially in the sections or districts where the building of small-income homes or resident property has heretofore been neglected.

There is no doubt but that there is a great demand for projects of this character, homes that will fit the needs of individuals with an income up to \$2,500 to \$3,000 per annum.

As a suggestion, I would think that it is necessary, or at least advisable, for the Government or for private business interests, especially those connected with the building trade, to immediately initiate a national campaign upon the passage of your bill so as to have each section organized where there has been a need determined for this type and class of construction.

A survey could be made nationally that would illustrate the exact number of such projects in various sections of the country and the publicity gained from such a survey would be of material assistance in stimulating this type of construction.